

Longmans' Class-Books of English Literature

THE FIRST CHAPTER
OF
MACAULAY'S
HISTORY OF ENGLAND

EDITED BY

DAVID SALMON

PRINCIPAL OF SWANSEA TRAINING COLLEGE

AUTHOR OF "THE ART OF TEACHING," "JOSEPH LANCASTER," ETC., ETC.

JOINT AUTHOR OF "INFANT SCHOOLS. THEIR HISTORY AND THEORY"

EDITOR OF "SIR ROGER DE COVERLEY," "MACAULAY'S ESSAY ON BACON,"

"MACAULAY'S FIRST ESSAY ON WILLIAM PITT," ETC., ETC.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1905

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
LORD MACAULAY	iii
HISTORY OF ENGLAND, CHAPTER I.	1
NOTES	159

LORD MACAULAY.¹

THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY was born at Rothley Temple, near Leicester (the home of his uncle, Thomas Babington), on St. Crispin's Day (25th October), 1800.

He was fortunate in many things but in nothing more than in his parents. His father, Zachary, was the son and grandson of Presbyterian ministers who, in lonely Highland manses, had cultivated literature on a little oatmeal. By residence in Jamaica he had learnt what slavery really meant, and the knowledge made him the most persistent opponent of a system which tended to reduce the masters to the level of the brute and to keep the slaves from rising above it. For forty years he devoted most of his time and thought, courage, will, and energy to the service of the negro. "In that service he sacrificed all that man may lawfully sacrifice—health, fortune, repose, favour, and celebrity."² His house at Clapham was the resort of the Abolitionists³—of Henry Thornton, William Wilberforce, Thomas Clarkson, and Granville Sharpe—and those who breathed its bracing moral atmosphere acquired, unconsciously, consideration for the rights and interests of others and hatred for whatever was mean and selfish.

Macaulay's mother, Selina Mills, came from a Quaker stock, and possessed in full measure the Quaker virtues—

¹ The standard biography is *The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*, by his nephew, Sir George Otto Trevelyan.

² Sir James Stephen in *The Edinburgh Review*.

³ *The Abolitionists*—those members of Parliament and their friends who were anxious to abolish slavery with all its horrors.

serenity, reticence, and sweet reasonableness. Under less wise guidance a child so richly endowed as her first-born would have developed conceit and arrogance ; but she, while noting with silent satisfaction every sign of precocity and genius, never let him suspect that she knew his powers to be more than ordinary.

He could read almost as soon as he could speak, and write almost as soon as he could read. At seven he composed a Compendium of Universal History ("and he really contrived to give a tolerably connected view of the leading events from the creation to the present time," says the pleased mother). Before he was eight, fired by Scott's *Lay* and *Marmion*, he began a poem on the Battle of Cheviot, and left off only to begin an epic on Olaus the Great, the mythical ancestor of the Aulays.

After attending for some years a day school kept by Mr. Greaves at Clapham, Macaulay was sent in 1812 to a boarding school kept by Mr. Preston,¹ first at Little Shelford near Cambridge, and afterwards at Aspenden Hall in Hertfordshire. His memory was then and ever remained prodigious. He seemed to take in the meaning of a printed page at a glance, and seemed incapable of forgetting whatever struck his attention. He used to say that if all the copies of *Paradise Lost* and *Pilgrim's Progress* were destroyed he would undertake to reproduce the text from recollection.

In October, 1818, Macaulay went into residence at Trinity College, Cambridge, thenceforward next to his home the dearest spot on earth to him. As his diligence was exemplary a brilliant career might have been predicted for him, but a retentive memory was not the first condition of success in Cambridge's most characteristic study. Even he could not find words to express his loathing for Mathematics, which

¹ "Not to name the school or the masters of men illustrious for literature is a kind of historical fraud by which honest fame is injuriously diminished."—*Dr. Johnson*.

gave him a daily headache without giving him "one practical truth or beautiful image in return". And though he loved the Classics his exercises lacked the technical perfection achieved by boys who had been trained at the public schools. He therefore did not graduate with honours, although he won certain prizes and was in 1824 elected a Fellow of Trinity.

When Macaulay went to college he did not suppose that he would ever be compelled to earn a living, because his father was then a wealthy man. But while Zachary had been trying to save the negroes his partner had succeeded in ruining his business. Hence the fellowship, ensuring an almost sufficient income for seven years, came most opportunely.

After leaving the University Macaulay read law, but, though he was called to the bar, he never obtained, and apparently never desired to obtain, any briefs. His interests were centred in politics and literature. When he was a boy at school his father and he used to exchange long letters on the questions of the day. Soon after going up to Cambridge he rushed into the thick of an election riot. His ardour was cooled by a dead cat received full in the face. The man who had thrown the beast apologised effusively, saying that it had been meant for Mr. Adeane. "I wish," replied Macaulay, "that you had meant it for me and hit Mr. Adeane."

In the eyes of Zachary Macaulay and his friends the reading of novels was always a folly and sometimes a sin. To *The Christian Observer*, the organ of the "Clapham Sect," as they were called, Macaulay, while still at school, sent an anonymous letter defending the practice. The editor had the candour to insert it, though he did not know that what he was thus publishing had been written by his own son.

In 1823 and 1824 that son wrote a series of bright articles for a magazine started by Charles Knight, the pioneer of the

cheap press, but these were thrown into the shade by the brilliance of the article on Milton which appeared in *The Edinburgh Review* for August, 1825. The success of this was startling, and subsequent articles in the same quarterly during the next seventeen years served only to increase the writer's fame.

In 1843, pirated editions of the articles having been issued in America, Macaulay consented to their being reprinted in England, although he states in the Preface that but for the piracy he would have refused "to let them appear in a form which might seem to indicate that he thought them worthy of a permanent place in English literature". That the public thought them worthy is proved by the unnumbered editions since issued and the innumerable copies sold.

Still the reluctance of Macaulay was justified, for, though the Essays have added vastly to his reputation with the general reader, they have laid him open to the censure of critics who condemn as literature what was written as journalism. *The Edinburgh Review* was established to promote the interests not of the Muses but of the Whigs. A party journalist is expected to express himself not with the coolness of a judge but with the warmth of an advocate, and every journalist aims at so presenting his case as to arrest the attention, convince the understanding, and impress the memory. Hence, while the origin of the Essays explains their clearness, vigour, antithesis, and epigram, it explains also their occasional lack of balance, exaggeration of statement, excess of ornament, and party bias.

In 1828 Lord Lyndhurst made Macaulay a Commissioner in Bankruptcy, and in 1830 Lord Lansdowne made him a member of Parliament. In 1833 he was offered and accepted a seat on the Supreme Council of India. When he returned in 1838 he left behind him as an abiding monument of his ability and industry the Penal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure.

In 1839 he became M.P. for Edinburgh, was appointed Secretary for War, and began writing the *History*; in 1842 he published *The Lays of Ancient Rome*; in 1846 he was made Paymaster of the Forces, and at the General Election of 1847 Edinburgh rejected him. He had been too much of a Whig to please the Radicals, too much of a Tory to please the Whigs, and he would not sacrifice his independence of thought and action to please anybody. He would always be proud, he told the electors, to think that he once enjoyed their favour; he would remember no less proudly how he risked and how he lost it. In 1852 Edinburgh atoned for her error by returning him unasked. In 1856 failing health obliged him to retire from Parliament, and in 1857 a peerage was conferred on him unsought.

The first and second volumes of the *History* were published in November, 1848. Writing to his sister in October he says: "I have armed myself with all my philosophy for the event of a failure". If he had any need of philosophy it was to bear success not failure. Probably no serious work had ever sold so rapidly in this country. A second edition was wanted in December, another was exhausted before the end of March, and by April there were half a dozen rival pirated editions circulating in the United States.

The third and fourth volumes were published in December, 1855, and sold even more rapidly. Twenty-five thousand copies were ordered before publication, and the cheque for £20,000 which was paid on account in March is still preserved by Messrs. Longmans as a curiosity.

Macaulay died on 28th December, 1859, leaving a fifth volume practically ready, but leaving untouched seven-eighths of the work which he had contemplated.

The popularity of the *History*, which remains unabated to this day, rests on Macaulay's original conception of what history should be, on the skill with which he marshalled his stupendous stores of knowledge, on the graphic and pictur-

esque narrative, and on the clearness of the style.¹ The *History* has the merits of the *Essays* without all their faults. The tone is more judicial; there is less dogmatism, less exaggeration of statement, and less ornamentation; there is (as far as was possible with Macaulay) an absence of party bias, and to say that the matter is as interesting as a novel is to pay a compliment—to novels—which few of them deserve.

Every contemporary who has written of him mentions his marvellous powers of conversation. Tom Moore, for instance, after dining with the Marquis of Lansdowne, writes: "The dinner and evening very agreeable; Macaulay wonderful. Never, perhaps, was there combined so much talent with so marvellous a memory." Of his confidence in his own judgment Lord Melbourne once said: "I wish that I was as sure of any one thing as Tom Macaulay is of everything". Sydney Smith, himself a great talker, admired Macaulay sincerely, but could not refrain from banter on his flow of words. Before he went to India his enemies might have said that he talked rather too much, "but now he has occasional flashes of silence that make his conversation perfectly delightful". "Oh, yes!" proceeds Smith, "we both talk a great deal, but I don't believe Macaulay ever did hear my voice! Sometimes when I have told a good story I have thought to myself, 'Poor Macaulay! he will be very sorry some day to have missed hearing that!'" Smith also wished that he could write poetry. He would, if he could, write an *Inferno*, and he would put Macaulay among a number of disputants and gag him!

¹ Some Lancashire operatives sent Macaulay a vote of thanks "for having written a history which working men could understand".

HISTORY OF ENGLAND

CHAPTER I

I PURPOSE to write the history of England from the accession of King James the Second down to a time which is within the memory of men still living. I shall recount the errors which, in a few months, alienated a loyal gentry and priesthood from the House of Stuart. I shall trace the course of that revolution which terminated the long struggle between our sovereigns and their parliaments, and bound up together the rights of the people and the title of the reigning dynasty. I shall relate how the new settlement was, during many troubled years, successfully defended against foreign and domestic enemies ; how, under that settlement, the authority of law and the security of property were found to be compatible with a liberty of discussion and of individual action never before known ; how, from the auspicious union of order and freedom, sprang a prosperity of which the annals of human affairs had furnished no example ; how our country, from a state of ignominious vassalage, rapidly rose to the place of umpire among European powers ; how her opulence and her martial glory grew together ; how, by wise and resolute good faith, was gradually established a public credit fruitful of marvels

which to the statesmen of any former age would have seemed incredible ; how a gigantic commerce gave birth to a maritime power, compared with which every other maritime power, ancient or modern, sinks into insignificance ; how Scotland, after ages of enmity, 5 was at length united to England, not merely by legal bonds, but by indissoluble ties of interest and affection ; how, in America, the British colonies rapidly became far mightier and wealthier than the realms which Cortes and Pizarro had added to the dominions of 10 Charles the Fifth ; how in Asia, British adventurers founded an empire not less splendid and more durable than that of Alexander.

Nor will it be less my duty faithfully to record disasters mingled with triumphs, and great national 15 crimes and follies far more humiliating than any disaster. It will be seen that even what we justly account our chief blessings were not without alloy. It will be seen that the system which effectually secured our liberties against the encroachments of 20 kingly power gave birth to a new class of abuses from which absolute monarchies are exempt. It will be seen that, in consequence partly of unwise interference, and partly of unwise neglect, the increase of wealth and the extension of trade produced, together with 25 immense good, some evils from which poor and rude societies are free. It will be seen how, in two important dependencies of the crown, wrong was followed by just retribution ; how imprudence and obstinacy broke the ties which bound the North 30 American colonies to the parent state ; how Ireland, cursed by the domination of race over race, and of religion over religion, remained indeed a member of the empire, but a withered and distorted member, adding no strength to the body politic, and reproach- 35 fully pointed at by all who feared or envied the greatness of England.

Yet, unless I greatly deceive myself, the general effect of this chequered narrative will be to excite thankfulness in all religious minds, and hope in the breasts of all patriots. For the history of our country during the last hundred and sixty years is eminently 5 the history of physical, of moral, and of intellectual improvement. Those who compare the age on which their lot has fallen with a golden age which exists only in their imagination may talk of degeneracy and decay: but no man who is correctly informed as to 10 the past will be disposed to take a morose or desponding view of the present.

I should very imperfectly execute the task which I have undertaken if I were merely to treat of battles and sieges, of the rise and fall of administrations, of 15 intrigues in the palace, and of debates in the parliament. It will be my endeavour to relate the history of the people as well as the history of the government, to trace the progress of useful and ornamental arts, to describe the rise of religious sects and the changes of 20 literary taste, to portray the manners of successive generations, and not to pass by with neglect even the revolutions which have taken place in dress, furniture, repasts, and public amusements. I shall cheerfully bear the reproach of having descended below the 25 dignity of history, if I can succeed in placing before the English of the nineteenth century a true picture of the life of their ancestors.

The events which I propose to relate form only a single act of a great and eventful drama extending 30 through ages, and must be very imperfectly understood unless the plot of the preceding acts be well known. I shall therefore introduce my narrative by a slight sketch of the history of our country from the earliest times. I shall pass very rapidly over many 35 centuries: but I shall dwell at some length on the vicissitudes of that contest which the administration

of King James the Second brought to a decisive crisis.¹

Nothing in the early existence of Britain indicated the greatness which she was destined to attain. Her inhabitants when first they became known to the 5 Tyrian mariners, were little superior to the natives of the Sandwich Islands. She was subjugated by the Roman arms ; but she received only a faint tincture of Roman arts and letters. Of the western provinces which obeyed the Cæsars, she was the last that was 10 conquered, and the first that was flung away. No magnificent remains of Latin porches and aqueducts are to be found in Britain. No writer of British birth is reckoned among the masters of Latin poetry and eloquence. It is not probable that the islanders were 15 at any time generally familiar with the tongue of their Italian rulers. From the Atlantic to the vicinity of the Rhine the Latin has, during many centuries, been predominant. It drove out the Celtic ; it was not driven out by the Teutonic ; and it is at this day 20 the basis of the French, Spanish and Portuguese languages. In our island the Latin appears never to have superseded the old Gaelic speech, and could not stand its ground against the German.

The scanty and superficial civilisation which the 25 Britons had derived from their southern masters was effaced by the calamities of the fifth century. In the continental kingdoms into which the Roman empire was then dissolved, the conquerors learned much from the conquered race. In Britain the conquered race 30 became as barbarous as the conquerors.

¹ In this, and in the next chapter, I have very seldom thought it necessary to cite authorities : for, in these chapters, I have not detailed events minutely, or used recondite materials ; and the facts which I mention are for the most part such that a person tolerably well read in English history, if not already apprised of them, will at least know where to look for evidence of them. In the subsequent chapters I shall carefully indicate the sources of my information.

All the chiefs who founded Teutonic dynasties in the continental provinces of the Roman empire, Alaric, Theodoric, Clovis, Alboin, were zealous Christians. The followers of Ida and Cerdic, on the other hand, brought to their settlements in Britain all the superstitions of the Elbe. While the German princes who reigned at Paris, Toledo, Arles, and Ravenna listened with reverence to the instructions of bishops, adored the relics of martyrs, and took part eagerly in disputes touching the Nicene theology, the rulers of Wessex and Mercia were still performing savage rites in the temples of Thor and Woden.

The continental kingdoms which had risen on the ruins of the Western Empire kept up some intercourse with those eastern provinces where the ancient civilisation, though slowly fading away under the influence of misgovernment, might still astonish and instruct barbarians, where the court still exhibited the splendour of Diocletian and Constantine, where the public buildings were still adorned with the sculptures of Polycletus and the paintings of Apelles, and where laborious pedants, themselves destitute of taste, sense, and spirit, could still read and interpret the masterpieces of Sophocles, of Demosthenes, and of Plato. From this communion Britain was cut off. Her shores were, to the polished race which dwelt by the Bosphorus, objects of a mysterious horror, such as that with which the Ionians of the age of Homer had regarded the Straits of Scylla and the city of the Læstrygonian cannibals. There was one province of our island in which, as Procopius had been told, the ground was covered with serpents, and the air was such that no man could inhale it and live. To this desolate region the spirits of the departed were ferried over from the land of the Franks at midnight. A strange race of fishermen performed the ghastly office. The speech of the dead was distinctly heard by the

boatmen : their weight made the keel sink deep in the water ; but their forms were invisible to mortal eye. Such were the marvels which an able historian, the contemporary of Belisarius, of Simplicius, and of Tribonian, gravely related in the rich and polite 5 Constantinople, touching the country in which the founder of Constantinople had assumed the imperial purple. Concerning all the other provinces of the Western Empire we have continuous information. It is only in Britain that an age of fable completely 10 separates two ages of truth. Odoacer and Totila, Euric and Thrasimund, Clovis, Fredegunda, and Brunchild, are historical men and women. But Hengist and Horsa, Vortigern and Rowena, Arthur and Mordred are mythical persons, whose very exist- 15 ence may be questioned, and whose adventures must be classed with those of Hercules and Romulus.

At length the darkness begins to break ; and the country which had been lost to view as Britain re-appears as England. The conversion of the Saxon 20 colonists to Christianity was the first of a long series of salutary revolutions. It is true that the Church had been deeply corrupted both by that superstition and by that philosophy against which she had long contended, and over which she had at last triumphed. 25 She had given a too easy admission to doctrines borrowed from the ancient schools, and to rites borrowed from the ancient temples. Roman policy and Gothic ignorance, Grecian ingenuity and Syrian asceticism, had contributed to deprave her. Yet she 30 retained enough of the sublime theology and benevolent morality of her earlier days to elevate many intellects, and to purify many hearts. Some things also which at a later period were justly regarded as among her chief blemishes were, in the seventh 35 century, and long afterwards, among her chief merits. That the sacerdotal order should encroach on the

functions of the civil magistrate would, in our time, be a great evil. But that which in an age of good government is an evil may, in an age of grossly bad government, be a blessing. It is better that mankind should be governed by wise laws well administered, 5 and by an enlightened public opinion, than by priestcraft: but it is better that men should be governed by priestcraft than by brute violence, by such a prelate as Dunstan than by such a warrior as Penda. A society sunk in ignorance, and ruled by mere 10 physical force, has great reason to rejoice when a class, of which the influence is intellectual and moral, rises to ascendancy. Such a class will doubtless abuse its power: but mental power, even when abused, is still a nobler and better power than that 15 which consists merely in corporeal strength. We read in our Saxon chronicles of tyrants, who, when at the height of greatness, were smitten with remorse, who abhorred the pleasures and dignities which they had purchased by guilt, who abdicated their crowns, 20 and who sought to atone for their offences by cruel penances and incessant prayers. These stories have drawn forth bitter expressions of contempt from some writers who, while they boasted of liberality, were in truth as narrow-minded as any monk of the dark 25 ages, and whose habit was to apply to all events in the history of the world the standard received in the Parisian society of the eighteenth century. Yet surely a system which, however deformed by superstition, introduced strong moral restraints into com- 30 munities previously governed only by vigour of muscle and by audacity of spirit, a system which taught the fiercest and mightiest ruler that he was, like his meanest bondman, a responsible being, might have seemed to deserve a more respectful 35 mention from philosophers and philanthropists.

The same observations will apply to the contempt

with which, in the last century, it was fashionable to speak of the pilgrimages, the sanctuaries, the crusades, and the monastic institutions of the middle ages. In times when men were scarcely ever induced to travel by liberal curiosity, or by the pursuit of gain, it was better that the rude inhabitant of the North should visit Italy and the East as a pilgrim, than that he should never see anything but those squalid cabins and uncleared woods amidst which he was born. In times when life and when female honour were exposed to daily risk from tyrants and marauders, it was better that the precinct of a shrine should be regarded with an irrational awe, than that there should be no refuge inaccessible to cruelty and licentiousness. In times when statesmen were incapable of forming extensive political combinations, it was better that the Christian nations should be roused and united for the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre, than that they should, one by one, be overwhelmed by the Mahometan power. Whatever reproach may, at a later period, have been justly thrown on the indolence and luxury of religious orders, it was surely good that, in an age of ignorance and violence, there should be quiet cloisters and gardens, in which the arts of peace could be safely cultivated, in which gentle and contemplative natures could find an asylum, in which one brother could employ himself in transcribing the *Æneid* of Virgil, and another in meditating the *Analytics* of Aristotle, in which he who had a genius for art might illuminate a martyrology or carve a crucifix, and in which he who had a turn for natural philosophy might make experiments on the properties of plants and minerals. Had not such retreats been scattered here and there, among the huts of a miserable peasantry, and the castles of a ferocious aristocracy, European society would have consisted merely of beasts of burden and

beasts of prey. The Church has many times been compared by divines to the ark of which we read in the Book of Genesis : but never was the resemblance more perfect than during that evil time when she alone rode, amidst darkness and tempest, on the 5 deluge beneath which all the great works of ancient power and wisdom lay entombed, bearing within her that feeble germ from which a second and more glorious civilisation was to spring.

Even the spiritual supremacy arrogated by the 10 Pope was, in the dark ages, productive of far more good than evil. Its effect was to unite the nations of Western Europe in one great commonwealth. What the Olympian chariot course and the Pythian oracle were to all the Greek cities, from Trebizond to 15 Marseilles, Rome and her Bishop were to all Christians of the Latin communion, from Calabria to the Hebrides. Thus grew up sentiments of enlarged benevolence. Races separated from each other by seas and mountains acknowledged a fraternal tie and 20 a common code of public law. Even in war, the cruelty of the conqueror was not seldom mitigated by the recollection that he and his vanquished enemies were all members of one great federation.

Into this federation our Saxon ancestors were now 25 admitted. A regular communication was opened between our shores and that part of Europe in which the traces of ancient power and policy were yet discernible. Many noble monuments which have since been destroyed or defaced still retained their 30 pristine magnificence ; and travellers, to whom Livy and Sallust were unintelligible, might gain from the Roman aqueducts and temples some faint notion of Roman history. The dome of Agrippa, still glittering with bronze, the mausoleum of Adrian, not yet 35 deprived of its columns and statues, the Flavian amphitheatre, not yet degraded into a quarry, told to

the rude English pilgrims some part of the story of that great civilised world which had passed away. The islanders returned, with awe deeply impressed on their half opened minds, and told the wondering inhabitants of the hovels of London and York that, 5 near the grave of Saint Peter, a mighty race, now extinct, had piled up buildings which would never be dissolved till the judgment day. Learning followed in the train of Christianity. The poetry and eloquence of the Augustan age was assiduously studied in 10 Mercian and Northumbrian monasteries. The names of Bede and Alcuin were justly celebrated throughout Europe. Such was the state of our country when, in the ninth century, began the last great migration of the northern barbarians. 15

During many years Denmark and Scandinavia continued to pour forth innumerable pirates, distinguished by strength, by valour, by merciless ferocity, and by hatred of the Christian name. No country suffered so much from these invaders as England. 20 Her coast lay near to the ports whence they sailed ; nor was any shire so far distant from the sea as to be secure from attack. The same atrocities which had attended the victory of the Saxon over the Celt were now, after the lapse of ages, suffered by the Saxon at 25 the hand of the Dane. Civilisation, just as it began to rise, was met by this blow, and sank down once more. Large colonies of adventurers from the Baltic established themselves on the eastern shores of our island, spread gradually westward, and, supported by 30 constant reinforcements from beyond the sea, aspired to the dominion of the whole realm. The struggle between the two fierce Teutonic breeds lasted through six generations. Each was alternately paramount. Cruel massacres followed by cruel retribution, pro- 35 vinces wasted, convents plundered, and cities rased to the ground, make up the greater part of the history

of those evil days. At length the North ceased to send forth a constant stream of fresh depredators; and from that time the mutual aversion of the races began to subside. Intermarriage became frequent. The Danes learned the religion of the Saxons; and thus one cause of deadly animosity was removed. The Danish and Saxon tongues, both dialects of one widespread language, were blended together. But the distinction between the two nations was by no means effaced, when an event took place which prostrated both, in common slavery and degradation, at the feet of a third people.

• The Normans were then the foremost race of Christendom. Their valour and ferocity had made them conspicuous among the rovers whom Scandinavia had sent forth to ravage Western Europe. Their sails were long the terror of both coasts of the Channel. Their arms were repeatedly carried far into the heart of the Carlovingian empire, and were victorious under the walls of Maestricht and Paris. At length one of the feeble heirs of Charlemagne ceded to the strangers a fertile province, watered by a noble river, and contiguous to the sea which was their favourite element. In that province they founded a mighty state, which gradually extended its influence over the neighbouring principalities of Brittany and Maine. Without laying aside that dauntless valour which had been the terror of every land from the Elbe to the Pyrenees, the Normans rapidly acquired all, and more than all, the knowledge and refinement which they found in the country where they settled. Their courage secured their territory against foreign invasion. They established internal order, such as had long been unknown in the Frank empire. They embraced Christianity; and with Christianity they learned a great part of what the clergy had to teach. They abandoned their native speech, and adopted the

French tongue, in which the Latin was the predominant element. They speedily raised their new language to a dignity and importance which it had never before possessed. They found it a barbarous jargon; they fixed it in writing; and they employed 5 it in legislation, in poetry, and in romance. They renounced that brutal intemperance to which all the other branches of the great German family were too much inclined. The polite luxury of the Norman presented a striking contrast to the coarse voracity 10 and drunkenness of his Saxon and Danish neighbours. He loved to display his magnificence, not in huge piles of food and hogsheads of strong drink, but in large and stately edifices, rich armour, gallant horses, choice falcons, well ordered tournaments, banquets 15 delicate rather than abundant, and wines remarkable rather for their exquisite flavour than for their intoxicating power. That chivalrous spirit, which has exercised so powerful an influence on the politics, morals, and manners of all the European nations, was 20 found in the highest exaltation among the Norman nobles. Those nobles were distinguished by their graceful bearing and insinuating address. They were distinguished also by their skill in negotiation, and by a natural eloquence which they assiduously 25 cultivated. It was the boast of one of their historians that the Norman gentlemen were orators from the cradle. But their chief fame was derived from their military exploits. Every country, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Dead Sea, witnessed the prodigies of 30 their discipline and valour. One Norman knight, at the head of a handful of warriors, scattered the Celts of Connaught. Another founded the monarchy of the Two Sicilies, and saw the emperors both of the East and of the West fly before his arms. A third, 35 the Ulysses of the first crusade, was invested by his fellow soldiers with the sovereignty of Antioch; and

a fourth, the Tancred whose name lives in the great poem of Tasso, was celebrated through Christendom as the bravest and most generous of the deliverers of the Holy Sepulchre.

The vicinity of so remarkable a people early began to produce an effect on the public mind of England. Before the Conquest, English princes received their education in Normandy. English sees and English estates were bestowed on Normans. The French of Normandy was familiarly spoken in the palace of Westminster. The court of Rouen seems to have been to the court of Edward the Confessor what the court of Versailles long afterwards was to the court of Charles the Second.

The battle of Hastings, and the events which followed it, not only placed a Duke of Normandy on the English throne, but gave up the whole population of England to the tyranny of the Norman race. The subjugation of a nation by a nation has seldom, even in Asia, been more complete. The country was portioned out among the captains of the invaders. Strong military institutions, closely connected with the institution of property, enabled the foreign conquerors to oppress the children of the soil. A cruel penal code, cruelly enforced, guarded the privileges, and even the sports, of the alien tyrants. Yet the subject race, though beaten down and trodden under foot, still made its sting felt. Some bold men, the favourite heroes of our oldest ballads, betook themselves to the woods, and there, in defiance of curfew laws and forest laws, waged a predatory war against their oppressors. Assassination was an event of daily occurrence. Many Normans suddenly disappeared leaving no trace. The corpses of many were found bearing the marks of violence. Death by torture was denounced against the murderers, and strict search was made for them, but generally in vain; for

the whole nation was in a conspiracy to screen them. It was at length thought necessary to lay a heavy fine on every Hundred in which a person of French extraction should be found slain ; and this regulation was followed up by another regulation, providing that every person who was found slain should be supposed to be a Frenchman, unless he was proved to be a Saxon.

During the century and a half which followed the Conquest, there is, to speak strictly, no English history. The French Kings of England rose, indeed, to an eminence which was the wonder and dread of all neighbouring nations. They conquered Ireland. They received the homage of Scotland. By their valour, by their policy, by their fortunate matrimonial alliances, they became far more powerful on the Continent than their liege lords the Kings of France. Asia, as well as Europe, was dazzled by the power and glory of our tyrants. Arabian chroniclers recorded with unwilling admiration the fall of Acre, the defence of Joppa, and the victorious march to Ascalon ; and Arabian mothers long awed their infants to silence with the name of the lionhearted Plantagenet. At one time it seemed that the line of Hugh Capet was about to end as the Merovingian and Carlovingian lines had ended, and that a single great monarchy would spread from the Orkneys to the Pyrenees. So strong an association is established in most minds between the greatness of a sovereign and the greatness of the nation which he rules, that almost every historian of England has expatiated with a sentiment of exultation on the power and splendour of her foreign masters, and has lamented the decay of that power and splendour as a calamity to our country. This is, in truth, as absurd as it would be in a Haytian negro of our time to dwell with national pride on the greatness of Lewis the Fourteenth, and to speak

of Blenheim and Ramilies with patriotic regret and shame. The Conqueror and his descendants to the fourth generation were not Englishmen: most of them were born in France: they spent the greater part of their lives in France: their ordinary speech 5 was French: almost every high office in their gift was filled by a Frenchman: every acquisition which they made on the Continent estranged them more and more from the population of our island. One of the ablest among them indeed attempted to win the 10 hearts of his English subjects by espousing an English princess. But, by many of his barons, this marriage was regarded as a marriage between a white planter and a quadroon girl would now be regarded in Virginia. In history he is known by the honourable 15 surname of Beauclerc; but, in his own time, his own countrymen called him by a Saxon nickname, in contemptuous allusion to his Saxon connection.

Had the Plantagenets, as at one time seemed likely, succeeded in uniting all France under their 20 government, it is probable that England would never have had an independent existence. Her princes, her lords, her prelates, would have been men differing in race and language from the artisans and the tillers of the earth. The revenues of her great pro- 25 prietors would have been spent in festivities and diversions on the banks of the Seine. The noble language of Milton and Burke would have remained a rustic dialect, without a literature, a fixed grammar, or a fixed orthography, and would have been con- 30 temptuously abandoned to the use of boors. No man of English extraction would have risen to eminence, except by becoming in speech and habits a Frenchman.

England owes her escape from such calamities to 35 an event which her historians have generally represented as disastrous. Her interest was so directly

opposed to the interest of her rulers that she had no hope but in their errors and misfortunes. The talents and even the virtues of her first six French Kings were a curse to her. The follies and vices of the seventh were her salvation. Had John inherited the great qualities of his father, of Henry Beauclerc, or of the Conqueror, nay, had he even possessed the martial courage of Stephen or of Richard, and had the King of France at the same time been as incapable as all the other successors of Hugh Capet had been, the House of Plantagenet must have risen to unrivalled ascendancy in Europe. But, just at this conjuncture, France, for the first time since the death of Charlemagne, was governed by a prince of great firmness and ability. On the other hand England, which, since the battle of Hastings, had been ruled generally by wise statesmen, always by brave soldiers, fell under the dominion of a trifler and a coward. From that moment her prospects brightened. John was driven from Normandy. The Norman nobles were compelled to make their election between the island and the continent. Shut up by the sea with the people whom they had hitherto oppressed and despised, they gradually came to regard England as their country, and the English as their countrymen. The two races, so long hostile, soon found that they had common interests and common enemies. Both were alike aggrieved by the tyranny of a bad king. Both were alike indignant at the favour shown by the court to the natives of Poitou and Aquitaine. The great-grandsons of those who had fought under William and the great-grandsons of those who had fought under Harold began to draw near to each other in friendship ; and the first pledge of their reconciliation was the Great Charter, won by their united exertions, and framed for their common benefit.

Here commences the history of the English nation.

The history of the preceding events is the history of wrongs inflicted and sustained by various tribes, which indeed all dwelt on English ground, but which regarded each other with aversion such as has scarcely ever existed between communities separated by physical barriers. For even the mutual animosity of countries at war with each other is languid when compared with the animosity of nations which, morally separated, are yet locally intermingled. In no country has the enmity of race been carried farther than in England. In no country has that enmity been more completely effaced. The stages of the process by which the hostile elements were melted down into one homogeneous mass are not accurately known to us. But it is certain that, when John became King, the distinction between Saxons and Normans was strongly marked, and that before the end of the reign of his grandson it had almost disappeared. In the time of Richard the First, the ordinary imprecation of a Norman gentleman was, "May I become an Englishman!" His ordinary form of indignant denial was "Do you take me for an Englishman?" The descendant of such a gentleman a hundred years later was proud of the English name.

The sources of the noblest rivers which spread fertility over continents, and bear richly laden fleets to the sea, are to be sought in wild and barren mountain tracts, incorrectly laid down in maps, and rarely explored by travellers. To such a tract the history of our country during the thirteenth century may not unaptly be compared. Sterile and obscure as is that portion of our annals, it is there that we must seek for the origin of our freedom, our prosperity, and our glory. Then it was that the great English people was formed, that the national character began to exhibit those peculiarities which it has ever since

retained, and that our fathers became emphatically islanders, islanders not merely in geographical position, but in their politics, their feelings, and their manners. Then first appeared with distinctness that constitution which has ever since, through all changes, preserved its identity ; that constitution of which all the other free constitutions in the world are copies, and which, in spite of some defects, deserves to be regarded as the best under which any great society has ever yet existed during many ages. Then it was that the House of Commons, the archetype of all the representative assemblies which now meet, either in the old or in the new world, held its first sittings. Then it was that the common law rose to the dignity of a science, and rapidly became a not unworthy rival of the imperial jurisprudence. Then it was that the courage of those sailors who manned the rude barks of the Cinque Ports first made the flag of England terrible on the seas. Then it was that the most ancient colleges which still exist at both the great national seats of learning were founded. Then was formed that language, less musical indeed than the languages of the south, but in force, in richness, in aptitude for all the highest purposes of the poet, the philosopher, and the orator, inferior to the tongue of Greece alone. Then too appeared the first faint dawn of that noble literature, the most splendid and the most durable of the many glories of England.

Early in the fourteenth century the amalgamation of the races was all but complete ; and it was soon made manifest, by signs not to be mistaken, that a people inferior to none existing in the world had been formed by the mixture of three branches of the great Teutonic family with each other, and with the aboriginal Britons. There was, indeed, scarcely any thing in common between the England to which John had been chased by Philip Augustus, and the England

from which the armies of Edward the Third went forth to conquer France.

A period of more than a hundred years followed, during which the chief object of the English was to establish, by force of arms, a great empire on the 5 Continent. The claim of Edward to the inheritance occupied by the House of Valois was a claim in which it might seem that his subjects were little interested. But the passion for conquest spread fast from the prince to the people. The war differed widely from 10 the wars which the Plantagenets of the twelfth century had waged against the descendants of Hugh Capet. For the success of Henry the Second, or of Richard the First, would have made England a province of France. The effect of the successes of 15 Edward the Third and Henry the Fifth was to make France, for a time, a province of England. The disdain with which, in the twelfth century, the conquerors from the Continent had regarded the islanders, was now retorted by the islanders on 20 the people of the Continent. Every yeoman from Kent to Northumberland valued himself as one of a race born for victory and dominion, and looked down with scorn on the nation before which his ancestors had trembled. Even those knights of 25 Gascony and Guienne who had fought gallantly under the Black Prince were regarded by the English as men of an inferior breed, and were contemptuously excluded from honourable and lucrative commands. In no long time our ancestors altogether lost sight 30 of the original ground of quarrel. They began to consider the crown of France as a mere appendage to the crown of England ; and when, in violation of the ordinary law of succession, they transferred the crown of England to the House of Lancaster, they 35 seem to have thought that the right of Richard the Second to the crown of France passed, as of course,

to that house. The zeal and vigour which they displayed present a remarkable contrast to the torpor of the French, who were far more deeply interested in the event of the struggle. The most splendid victories recorded in the history of the middle ages 5 were gained at this time, against great odds, by the English armies. Victories indeed they were of which a nation may justly be proud ; for they are to be attributed to the moral superiority of the victors, a superiority which was most striking in the lowest 10 ranks. The knights of England found worthy rivals in the knights of France. Chandos encountered an equal foe in Du Guesclin. But France had no infantry that dared to face the English bows and bills. A French King was brought prisoner to 15 London. An English King was crowned at Paris. The banner of Saint George was carried far beyond the Pyrenees and the Alps. On the south of the Ebro the English won a great battle, which for a time decided the fate of Leon and Castile ; and the 20 English Companies obtained a terrible preeminence among the bands of warriors who let out their weapons for hire to the princes and commonwealths of Italy.

Nor were the arts of peace neglected by our 25 fathers during that stirring period. While France was wasted by war, till she at length found in her own desolation a miserable defence against invaders, the English gathered in their harvests, adorned their cities, pleaded, traded, and studied in security. Many 30 of our noblest architectural monuments belong to that age. Then rose the fair chapels of New College and of Saint George, the nave of Winchester and the choir of York, the spire of Salisbury and the majestic towers of Lincoln. A copious and forcible language, 35 formed by an infusion of French into German, was now the common property of the aristocracy and of

the people. Nor was it long before genius began to apply that admirable machine to worthy purposes. While English warriors, leaving behind them the devastated provinces of France, entered Valladolid in triumph, and spread terror to the gates of Florence, 5 English poets depicted in vivid tints all the wide variety of human manners and fortunes, and English thinkers aspired to know, or dared to doubt, where bigots had been content to wonder and to believe. The same age which produced the Black Prince 10 and Derby, Chandos and Hawkwood, produced also Geoffrey Chaucer and John Wycliffe.

In so splendid and imperial a manner did the English people, properly so called, first take place among the nations of the world. Yet while we con- 15 template with pleasure the high and commanding qualities which our forefathers displayed, we cannot but admit that the end which they pursued was an end condemned both by humanity and by enlightened policy, and that the reverses which compelled them, 20 after a long and bloody struggle, to relinquish the hope of establishing a great continental empire, were really blessings in the guise of disasters. The spirit of the French was at last aroused: they began to oppose a vigorous national resistance to the foreign 25 conquerors; and from that time the skill of the English captains and the courage of the English soldiers were, happily for mankind, exerted in vain. After many desperate struggles, and with many bitter regrets, our ancestors gave up the contest. Since 30 that age no British government has ever seriously and steadily pursued the design of making great conquests on the Continent. The people, indeed, continued to cherish with pride the recollection of Cressy, of Poitiers, and of Agincourt. Even after the 35 lapse of many years it was easy to fire their blood and to draw forth their subsidies by promising them

an expedition for the conquest of France. But happily the energies of our country have been directed to better objects ; and she now occupies in the history of mankind a place far more glorious than if she had, as at one time seemed not improbable, acquired by 5 the sword an ascendancy similar to that which formerly belonged to the Roman republic.

Cooped up once more within the limits of the island, the warlike people employed in civil strife those arms which had been the terror of Europe. 10 The means of profuse expenditure had long been drawn by the English barons from the oppressed provinces of France. That source of supply was gone : but the ostentatious and luxurious habits which prosperity had engendered still remained ; and 15 the great lords, unable to gratify their tastes by plundering the French, were eager to plunder each other. The realm to which they were now confined would not, in the phrase of Comines, the most judicious observer of that time, suffice for them all. Two 20 aristocratical factions, headed by two branches of the royal family, engaged in a long and fierce struggle for supremacy. As the animosity of those factions did not really arise from the dispute about the succession, it lasted long after all ground of dispute 25 about the succession was removed. The party of the Red Rose survived the last prince who claimed the crown in right of Henry the Fourth. The party of the White Rose survived the marriage of Richmond and Elizabeth. Left without chiefs who had any 30 decent show of right, the adherents of Lancaster rallied round a line of bastards, and the adherents of York set up a succession of impostors. When, at length, many aspiring nobles had perished on the field of battle or by the hands of the executioner, 35 when many illustrious houses had disappeared for ever from history, when those great families which

remained had been exhausted and sobered by calamities, it was universally acknowledged that the claims of all the contending Plantagenets were united in the house of Tudor.

Meanwhile a change was proceeding infinitely 5 more momentous than the acquisition or loss of any province, than the rise or fall of any dynasty. Slavery and the evils by which slavery is everywhere accompanied were fast disappearing.

It is remarkable that the two greatest and most 10 salutary social revolutions which have taken place in England, that revolution which, in the thirteenth century, put an end to the tyranny of nation over nation, and that revolution which, a few generations later, put an end to the property of man in man, were 15 silently and imperceptibly effected. They struck contemporary observers with no surprise, and have received from historians a very scanty measure of attention. They were brought about neither by legislative regulation nor by physical force. Moral causes 20 noiselessly effaced first the distinction between Norman and Saxon, and then the distinction between master and slave. None can venture to fix the precise moment at which either distinction ceased. Some faint traces of the old Norman feeling might perhaps 25 have been found late in the fourteenth century. Some faint traces of the institution of villenage were detected by the curious so late as the days of the Stuarts ; nor has that institution ever, to this hour, been abolished by statute. 30

It would be most unjust not to acknowledge that the chief agent in these two great deliverances was religion ; and it may perhaps be doubted whether a purer religion might not have been found a less efficient agent. The benevolent spirit of the Christian 35 morality is undoubtedly adverse to distinctions of caste. But to the Church of Rome such distinctions

are peculiarly odious ; for they are incompatible with other distinctions which are essential to her system. She ascribes to every priest a mysterious dignity which entitles him to the reverence of every layman ; and she does not consider any man as disqualified, 5 by reason of his nation or of his family, for the priesthood. Her doctrines respecting the sacerdotal character, however erroneous they may be, have repeatedly mitigated some of the worst evils which can afflict society. That superstition cannot be re- 10 garded as unmixedly noxious which, in regions cursed by the tyranny of race over race, creates an aristocracy altogether independent of race, inverts the relation between the oppressor and the oppressed, and compels the hereditary master to kneel before the spiritual 15 tribunal of the hereditary bondman. To this day, in some countries where negro slavery exists, Popery appears in advantageous contrast to other forms of Christianity. It is notorious that the antipathy between the European and African races is by no 20 means so strong at Rio Janeiro as at Washington. In our own country this peculiarity of the Roman Catholic system produced, during the middle ages, many salutary effects. It is true that, shortly after the battle of Hastings, Saxon prelates and abbots 25 were violently deposed, and that ecclesiastical adventurers from the Continent were intruded by hundreds into lucrative benefices. Yet even then pious divines of Norman blood raised their voices against such a violation of the constitution of the Church, refused 30 to accept mitres from the hands of William, and charged him, on the peril of his soul, not to forget that the vanquished islanders were his fellow Christians. The first protector whom the English found among the dominant caste was Archbishop Anselm. 35 At a time when the English name was a reproach, and when all the civil and military dignities of the

kingdom were supposed to belong exclusively to the countrymen of the Conqueror, the despised race learned, with transports of delight, that one of themselves, Nicholas Breakspear, had been elevated to the papal throne, and had held out his foot to be kissed 5 by ambassadors sprung from the noblest houses of Normandy. It was a national as well as a religious feeling that drew great multitudes to the shrine of Becket, whom they regarded as the enemy of their enemies. Whether he was a Norman or a Saxon 10 may be doubted: but there is no doubt that he perished by Norman hands, and that the Saxons cherished his memory with peculiar tenderness and veneration, and, in their popular poetry, represented him as one of their own race. A successor of Becket 15 was foremost among the refractory magnates who obtained that charter which secured the privileges both of the Norman barons and of the Saxon yeomanry. How great a part the Roman Catholic ecclesiastics subsequently had in the abolition of 20 villenage we learn from the unexceptionable testimony of Sir Thomas Smith, one of the ablest Protestant counsellors of Elizabeth. When the dying slaveholder asked for the last sacraments, his spiritual attendants regularly adjured him, as he loved his 25 soul, to emancipate his brethren for whom Christ had died. So successfully had the Church used her formidable machinery that, before the Reformation came, she had enfranchised almost all the bondmen in the kingdom except her own, who, to do her 30 justice, seem to have been very tenderly treated.

There can be no doubt that, when these two great revolutions had been effected, our forefathers were by far the best governed people in Europe. During three hundred years the social system had been in a 35 constant course of improvement. Under the first Plantagenets there had been barons able to bid

defiance to the sovereign, and peasants degraded to the level of the swine and oxen which they tended. The exorbitant power of the baron had been gradually reduced. The condition of the peasant had been gradually elevated. Between the aristocracy and the working people had sprung up a middle class, agricultural and commercial. There was still, it may be, more inequality than is favourable to the happiness and virtue of our species : but no man was altogether above the restraints of law ; and no man was altogether below its protection.

That the political institutions of England were, at this early period, regarded by the English with pride and affection, and by the most enlightened men of neighbouring nations with admiration and envy, is proved by the clearest evidence. But touching the nature of those institutions there has been much dishonest and acrimonious controversy.

The historical literature of England has indeed suffered grievously from a circumstance which has not a little contributed to her prosperity. The change, great as it is, which her polity has undergone during the last six centuries, has been the effect of gradual development, not of demolition and reconstruction. The present constitution of our country is, to the constitution under which she flourished five hundred years ago, what the tree is to the sapling, what the man is to the boy. The alteration has been great. Yet there never was a moment at which the chief part of what existed was not old. A polity thus formed must abound in anomalies. But for the evils arising from mere anomalies we have ample compensation. Other societies possess written constitutions more symmetrical. But no other society has yet succeeded in uniting revolution with prescription, progress with stability, the energy of youth with the majesty of immemorial antiquity.

This great blessing, however, has its drawbacks : and one of those drawbacks is that every source of information as to our early history has been poisoned by party spirit. As there is no country where statesmen have been so much under the influence of the 5 past, so there is no country where historians have been so much under the influence of the present. Between these two things, indeed, there is a natural connection. Where history is regarded merely as a picture of life and manners, or as a collection of 10 experiments from which general maxims of civil wisdom may be drawn, a writer lies under no very pressing temptation to misrepresent transactions of ancient date. But where history is regarded as a repository of titled deeds, on which the rights of govern- 15 ments and nations depend, the motive to falsification becomes almost irresistible. A Frenchman is not now impelled by any strong interest either to exaggerate or to underrate the power of the Kings of the house of Valois. The privileges of the States 20 General, of the States of Brittany, of the States of Burgundy, are to him matters of as little practical importance as the constitution of the Jewish Sanhedrim or of the Amphictyonic Council. The gulph of a great revolution completely separates the new from the 25 old system. No such chasm divides the existence of the English nation into two distinct parts. Our laws and customs have never been lost in general and irreparable ruin. With us the precedents of the middle ages are still valid precedents, and are still 30 cited, on the gravest occasions, by the most eminent statesmen. For example, when King George the Third was attacked by the malady which made him incapable of performing his regal functions, and when the most distinguished lawyers and politicians differed 35 widely as to the course which ought, in such circumstances, to be pursued, the Houses of Parliament

would not proceed to discuss any plan of regency till all the precedents which were to be found in our annals, from the earliest times, had been collected and arranged. Committees were appointed to examine the ancient records of the realm. The first case reported was that of the year 1217 : much importance was attached to the cases of 1326, of 1377, and of 1422 : but the case which was justly considered as most in point was that of 1455. Thus in our country the dearest interests of parties have frequently been staked on the results of the researches of antiquaries. The inevitable consequence was that our antiquaries conducted their researches in the spirit of partisans.

It is therefore not surprising that those who have written concerning the limits of prerogative and liberty in the old polity of England should generally have shown the temper, not of judges, but of angry and uncandid advocates. For they were discussing, not a speculative matter, but a matter which had a direct and practical connection with the most momentous and exciting disputes of their own day. From the commencement of the long contest between the Parliament and the Stuarts down to the time when the pretensions of the Stuarts ceased to be formidable, few questions were practically more important than the question whether the administration of that family had or had not been in accordance with the ancient constitution of the kingdom. This question could be decided only by reference to the records of preceding reigns. Bracton and Fleta, the Mirror of Justice and the Rolls of Parliament, were ransacked to find pretexts for the excesses of the Star Chamber on one side, and of the High Court of Justice on the other. During a long course of years every Whig historian was anxious to prove that the old English government was all but republican, every Tory historian to prove that it was all but despotic.

With such feelings, both parties looked into the chronicles of the middle ages. Both readily found what they sought; and both obstinately refused to see anything but what they sought. The champions of the Stuarts could easily point out instances of oppression exercised on the subject. The defenders of the Roundheads could as easily produce instances of determined and successful resistance offered to the Crown. The Tories quoted, from ancient writings, expressions almost as servile as were heard from the pulpit of Mainwaring. The Whigs discovered expressions as bold and severe as any that resounded from the judgment seat of Bradshaw. One set of writers adduced numerous instances in which Kings had extorted money without the authority of Parliament. Another set cited cases in which the Parliament had assumed to itself the power of inflicting punishment on Kings. Those who saw only one half of the evidence would have concluded that the Plantagenets were as absolute as the Sultans of Turkey: those who saw only the other half would have concluded that the Plantagenets had as little real power as the Doges of Venice; and both conclusions would have been equally remote from the truth.

The old English government was one of a class of limited monarchies which sprang up in Western Europe during the middle ages, and which, notwithstanding many diversities, bore to one another a strong family likeness. That there should have been such a likeness is not strange. The countries in which those monarchies arose had been provinces of the same great civilised empire, and had been overrun and conquered, about the same time, by tribes of the same rude and warlike nation. They were members of the same great coalition against Islam. They were in communion with the same superb and ambitious

Church. Their polity naturally took the same form. They had institutions derived partly from imperial Rome, partly from papal Rome, partly from the old Germany. All had Kings; and in all the kingly office became by degrees strictly hereditary. All had nobles bearing titles which had originally indicated military rank. The dignity of knighthood, the rules of heraldry, were common to all. All had richly endowed ecclesiastical establishments, municipal corporations enjoying large franchises, and senates whose consent was necessary to the validity of some public acts.

Of these kindred constitutions the English was, from an early period, justly reputed the best. The prerogatives of the sovereign were undoubtedly extensive. The spirit of religion and the spirit of chivalry concurred to exalt his dignity. The sacred oil had been poured on his head. It was no disparagement to the bravest and noblest knights to kneel at his feet. His person was inviolable. He alone was entitled to convoke the Estates of the realm: he could at his pleasure dismiss them; and his assent was necessary to all their legislative acts. He was the chief of the executive administration, the sole organ of communication with foreign powers, the captain of the military and naval forces of the state, the fountain of justice, of mercy, and of honour. He had large powers for the regulation of trade. It was by him that money was coined, that weights and measures were fixed, that marts and havens were appointed. His ecclesiastical patronage was immense. His hereditary revenues, economically administered, sufficed to meet the ordinary charges of government. His own domains were of vast extent. He was also feudal lord paramount of the whole soil of his kingdom, and, in that capacity, possessed many lucrative and many formidable rights, which enabled him to

annoy and depress those who thwarted him, and to enrich and aggrandise, without any cost to himself, those who enjoyed his favour.

But his power, though ample, was limited by three great constitutional principles, so ancient that none 5 can say when they began to exist, so potent that their natural development, continued through many generations, has produced the order of things under which we now live.

First, the King could not legislate without the 10 consent of his Parliament. Secondly, he could impose no tax without the consent of his Parliament. Thirdly, he was bound to conduct the executive administration according to the laws of the land, and, if he broke those laws, his advisers and his agents were 15 responsible.

No candid Tory will deny that these principles had, five hundred years ago, acquired the authority of fundamental rules. On the other hand, no candid Whig will affirm that they were, till a later period, 20 cleared from all ambiguity, or followed out to all their consequences. A constitution of the middle ages was not, like a constitution of the eighteenth or nineteenth century, created entire by a single act, and fully set forth in a single document. It is only in a refined 25 and speculative age that a polity is constructed on system. In rude societies the progress of government resembles the progress of language and of versification. Rude societies have language, and often copious and energetic language: but they have no scientific 30 grammar, no definitions of nouns and verbs, no names for declensions, moods, tenses, and voices. Rude societies have versification, and often versification of great power and sweetness: but they have no metrical canons; and the minstrel whose numbers, regulated 35 solely by his ear, are the delight of his audience, would himself be unable to say of how many dactyls and

trochees each of his lines consists. As eloquence exists before syntax, and song before prosody, so government may exist in a high degree of excellence long before the limits of legislative, executive, and judicial power have been traced with precision. 5

It was thus in our country. The line which bounded the royal prerogative, though in general sufficiently clear, had not everywhere been drawn with accuracy and distinctness. There was, therefore, near the border some debatable ground on which incursions 10 and reprisals continued to take place, till, after ages of strife, plain and durable landmarks were at length set up. It may be instructive to note in what way, and to what extent, our ancient sovereigns were in the habit of violating the three great principles by 15 which the liberties of the nation were protected.

No English King has ever laid claim to the general legislative power. The most violent and imperious Plantagenet never fancied himself competent to enact, without the consent of his great 20 council, that a jury should consist of ten persons instead of twelve, that a widow's dower should be a fourth part instead of a third, that perjury should be a felony, or that the custom of gavelkind should be introduced into Yorkshire.¹ But the King had the 25 power of pardoning offenders; and there is one point at which the power of pardoning and the power of legislating seem to fade into each other, and may easily, at least in a simple age, be confounded. A penal statute is virtually annulled if the penalties 30 which it imposes are regularly remitted as often as they are incurred. The sovereign was undoubtedly competent to remit penalties without limit. He was therefore competent to annul virtually a penal statute. It might seem that there could be no serious objec- 35

¹ This is excellently put by Mr. Hallam in the first chapter of his Constitutional History.

tion to his doing formally what he might do virtually. Thus, with the help of subtle and courtly lawyers, grew up, on the doubtful frontier which separates executive from legislative functions, that great anomaly known as the dispensing power.

That the King could not impose taxes without the consent of Parliament is admitted to have been, from time immemorial, a fundamental law of England. It was among the articles which John was compelled by the Barons to sign. Edward the First ventured to break through the rule: but, able, powerful, and popular as he was, he encountered an opposition to which he found it expedient to yield. He covenanted accordingly in express terms, for himself and his heirs, that they would never again levy any aid without the assent and goodwill of the Estates of the realm. His powerful and victorious grandson attempted to violate this solemn compact: but the attempt was strenuously withstood. At length the Plantagenets gave up the point in despair: but, though they ceased to infringe the law openly, they occasionally contrived, by evading it, to procure an extraordinary supply for a temporary purpose. They were interdicted from taxing; but they claimed the right of begging and borrowing. They therefore sometimes begged in a tone not easily to be distinguished from that of command, and sometimes borrowed with small thought of repaying. But the fact that they thought it necessary to disguise their exactions under the names of benevolences and loans sufficiently proves that the authority of the great constitutional rule was universally recognised.

The principle that the King of England was bound to conduct the administration according to law, and that, if he did anything against law, his advisers and agents were answerable, was established at a very early period, as the severe judgments pronounced and executed on many royal favourites sufficiently prove.

It is, however, certain that the rights of individuals were often violated by the Plantagenets, and that the injured parties were often unable to obtain redress. According to law no Englishman could be arrested or detained in confinement merely by the mandate of the sovereign. In fact, persons obnoxious to the government were frequently imprisoned without any other authority than a royal order. According to law, torture, the disgrace of the Roman jurisprudence, could not, in any circumstances, be inflicted on an English subject. Nevertheless, during the troubles of the fifteenth century, a rack was introduced into the Tower, and was occasionally used under the plea of political necessity. But it would be a great error to infer from such irregularities that the English monarchs were, either in theory or in practice, absolute. We live in a highly civilised society, through which intelligence is so rapidly diffused by means of the press and of the post office that any gross act of oppression committed in any part of our island is, in a few hours, discussed by millions. If the sovereign were now to immure a subject in defiance of the writ of Habeas Corpus, or to put a conspirator to the torture, the whole nation would be instantly electrified by the news. In the middle ages the state of society was widely different. Rarely and with great difficulty did the wrongs of individuals come to the knowledge of the public. A man might be illegally confined during many months in the castle of Carlisle or Norwich; and no whisper of the transaction might reach London. It is highly probable that the rack had been many years in use before the great majority of the nation had the least suspicion that it was ever employed. Nor were our ancestors by any means so much alive as we are to the importance of maintaining great general rules. We have been taught by long experience that we cannot without danger suffer

any breach of the constitution to pass unnoticed. It is therefore now universally held that a government which unnecessarily exceeds its powers ought to be visited with severe parliamentary censure, and that a government which, under the pressure of a great exigency, and with pure intentions, has exceeded its powers, ought without delay to apply to Parliament for an act of indemnity. But such were not the feelings of the Englishmen of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. They were little disposed to contend for a principle merely as a principle, or to cry out against an irregularity which was not also felt to be a grievance. As long as the general spirit of the administration was mild and popular, they were willing to allow some latitude to their sovereign. If, for ends generally acknowledged to be good, he exerted a vigour beyond the law, they not only forgave, but applauded him, and while they enjoyed security and prosperity under his rule, were but too ready to believe that whoever had incurred his displeasure had deserved it. But to this indulgence there was a limit ; nor was that King wise who presumed far on the forbearance of the English people. They might sometimes allow him to overstep the constitutional line : but they also claimed the privilege of overstepping that line themselves, whenever his encroachments were so serious as to excite alarm. If, not content with occasionally oppressing individuals, he dared to oppress great masses, his subjects promptly appealed to the laws, and, that appeal failing, appealed as promptly to the God of battles.

Our forefathers might indeed safely tolerate a king in a few excesses ; for they had in reserve a check which soon brought the fiercest and proudest king to reason, the check of physical force. It is difficult for an Englishman of the nineteenth century to imagine to himself the facility and rapidity with

which, four hundred years ago, this check was applied. The people have long unlearned the use of arms. The art of war has been carried to a perfection unknown to former ages; and the knowledge of that art is confined to a particular class. A hundred 5 thousand soldiers, well disciplined and commanded, will keep down ten millions of ploughmen and artisans. A few regiments of household troops are sufficient to overawe all the discontented spirits of a large capital. In the meantime the effect of the con- 10 stant progress of wealth has been to make insurrection far more terrible to thinking men than maladministration. Immense sums have been expended on works which, if a rebellion broke out, might perish in a few hours. The mass of movable wealth collected in the 15 shops and warehouses of London alone exceeds five hundredfold that which the whole island contained in the days of the Plantagenets; and, if the government were subverted by physical force, all this movable wealth would be exposed to imminent risk of spolia- 20 tion and destruction. Still greater would be the risk to public credit, on which thousands of families directly depend for subsistence, and with which the credit of the whole commercial world is inseparably connected. It is no exaggeration to say that a civil 25 war of a week on English ground would now produce disasters which would be felt from the Hoangho to the Missouri, and of which the traces would be discernible at the distance of a century. In such a state of society resistance must be regarded as a cure 30 more desperate than almost any malady which can afflict the state. In the middle ages, on the contrary, resistance was an ordinary remedy for political distempers, a remedy which was always at hand, and which, though doubtless sharp at the moment, produced no deep or lasting ill effects. If a popular 35 chief raised his standard in a popular cause, an

irregular army could be assembled in a day. Regular army there was none. Every man had a slight tincture of soldiership, and scarcely any man more than a slight tincture. The national wealth consisted chiefly in flocks and herds, in the harvest of the year, 5 and in the simple buildings inhabited by the people. All the furniture, the stock of shops, the machinery which could be found in the realm was of less value than the property which some single parishes now contain. Manufactures were rude ; credit was almost 10 unknown. Society, therefore, recovered from the shock as soon as the actual conflict was over. The calamities of civil war were confined to the slaughter on the field of battle, and to a few subsequent executions and confiscations. In a week the peasant was 15 driving his team and the esquire flying his hawks over the field of Towton or of Bosworth, as if no extraordinary event had interrupted the regular course of human life.

More than a hundred and sixty years have now 20 elapsed since the English people have by force subverted a government. During the hundred and sixty years which preceded the union of the Roses, nine Kings reigned in England. Six of these nine Kings were deposed. Five lost their lives as well as their 25 crowns. It is evident, therefore, that any comparison between our ancient and our modern polity must lead to most erroneous conclusions, unless large allowance be made for the effect of that restraint which resistance and the fear of resistance constantly 30 imposed on the Plantagenets. As our ancestors had against tyranny a most important security which we want, they might safely dispense with some securities to which we justly attach the highest importance. As we cannot, without the risk of evils from which 35 the imagination recoils, employ physical force as a check on misgovernment, it is evidently our wisdom

to keep all the constitutional checks on misgovernment in the highest state of efficiency, to watch with jealousy the first beginnings of encroachment, and never to suffer irregularities, even when harmless in themselves, to pass unchallenged, lest they acquire the force of precedents. Four hundred years ago such minute vigilance might well seem unnecessary. A nation of hardy archers and spearmen might, with small risk to its liberties, connive at some illegal acts on the part of a prince whose general administration was good, and whose throne was not defended by a single company of regular soldiers.

Under this system, rude as it may appear when compared with those elaborate constitutions of which the last seventy years have been fruitful, the English long enjoyed a large measure of freedom and happiness. Though, during the feeble reign of Henry the Sixth, the state was torn, first by factions, and at length by civil war; though Edward the Fourth was a prince of dissolute and imperious character; though Richard the Third has generally been represented as a monster of depravity; though the exactions of Henry the Seventh caused great repining; it is certain that our ancestors, under those Kings, were far better governed than the Belgians under Philip, surnamed the Good, or the French under that Lewis who was styled the Father of his people. Even while the wars of the Roses were actually raging, our country appears to have been in a happier condition than the neighbouring realms during years of profound peace. Comines was one of the most enlightened statesmen of his time. He had seen all the richest and most highly civilised parts of the Continent. He had lived in the opulent towns of Flanders, the Manchesters and Liverpools of the fifteenth century. He had visited Florence, recently adorned by the magnificence of Lorenzo, and Venice,

not yet humbled by the Confederates of Cambray. This eminent man deliberately pronounced England to be the best governed country of which he had any knowledge. Her constitution he emphatically designated as a just and holy thing, which, while it 5 protected the people, really strengthened the hands of a prince who respected it. In no other country, he said, were men so effectually secured from wrong. The calamities produced by our intestine wars seemed to him to be confined to the nobles and the fighting 10 men, and to leave no traces such as he had been accustomed to see elsewhere, no ruined dwellings, no depopulated cities.

It was not only by the efficiency of the restraints imposed on the royal prerogative that England was 15 advantageously distinguished from most of the neighbouring countries. A peculiarity equally important, though less noticed, was the relation in which the nobility stood here to the commonalty. There was a strong hereditary aristocracy: but it was of all 20 hereditary aristocracies the least insolent and exclusive. It had none of the invidious character of a caste. It was constantly receiving members from the people, and constantly sending down members to mingle with the people. Any gentleman might 25 become a peer. The younger son of a peer was but a gentleman. Grandsons of peers yielded precedence to newly made knights. The dignity of knighthood was not beyond the reach of any man who could by diligence and thrift realise a good estate, or who 30 could attract notice by his valour in a battle or a siege. It was regarded as no disparagement for the daughter of a Duke, nay of a royal Duke, to espouse a distinguished commoner. Thus, Sir John Howard married the daughter of Thomas Mowbray Duke of 35 Norfolk. Sir Richard Pole married the Countess of Salisbury, daughter of George Duke of Clarence.

Good blood was indeed held in high respect : but between good blood and the privileges of peerage there was, most fortunately for our country, no necessary connection. Pedigrees as long, and scutcheons as old, were to be found out of the House of 5 Lords as in it. There were new men who bore the highest titles. There were untitled men well known to be descended from knights who had broken the Saxon ranks at Hastings, and scaled the walls of Jerusalem. There were Bohuns, Mowbrays, De Veres, 10 nay, kinsmen of the House of Plantagenet, with no higher addition than that of Esquire, and with no civil privileges beyond those enjoyed by every farmer and shopkeeper. There was therefore here no line like that which in some other countries divided the 15 patrician from the plebeian. The yeoman was not inclined to murmur at dignities to which his own children might rise. The grandee was not inclined to insult a class into which his own children must descend.

20

After the wars of York and Lancaster, the links which connected the nobility and the commonalty became closer and more numerous than ever. The extent of the destruction which had fallen on the old aristocracy may be inferred from a single circum- 25 stance. In the year 1451 Henry the Sixth summoned fifty-three temporal Lords to parliament. The temporal Lords summoned by Henry the Seventh to the parliament of 1485 were only twenty-nine, and of these several had recently been elevated to the 30 peerage. During the following century the ranks of the nobility were largely recruited from among the gentry. The constitution of the House of Commons tended greatly to promote the salutary intermixture of classes. The knight of the shire was the connect- 35 ing link between the baron and the shopkeeper. On the same benches on which sate the goldsmiths,

drapers, and grocers, who had been returned to parliament by the commercial towns, sate also members who, in any other country, would have been called noblemen, hereditary lords of manors, entitled to hold courts and to bear coat armour, and able to trace back an honourable descent through many generations. Some of them were younger sons and brothers of lords. Others could boast of even royal blood. At length the eldest son of an Earl of Bedford, called in courtesy by the second title of his father, offered himself as candidate for a seat in the House of Commons, and his example was followed by others. Seated in that house, the heirs of the great peers naturally became as zealous for its privileges as any of the humble burgesses with whom they were mingled. Thus our democracy was, from an early period, the most aristocratic, and our aristocracy the most democratic in the world ; a peculiarity which has lasted down to the present day, and which has produced many important moral and political effects.

The government of Henry the Seventh, of his son, and of his grandchildren was, on the whole, more arbitrary than that of the Plantagenets. Personal character may in some degree explain the difference ; for courage and force of will were common to all the men and women of the House of Tudor. They exercised their power during a period of a hundred and twenty years, always with vigour, often with violence, sometimes with cruelty. They, in imitation of the dynasty which had preceded them, occasionally invaded the rights of the subject, occasionally exacted taxes under the name of loans and gifts, and occasionally dispensed with penal statutes : nay, though they never presumed to enact any permanent law by their own authority, they occasionally took upon themselves, when Parliament was not sitting, to meet temporary exigencies by temporary edicts. It was, however,

impossible for the Tudors to carry oppression beyond a certain point : for they had no armed force, and they were surrounded by an armed people. Their palace was guarded by a few domestics, whom the array of a single shire, or of a single ward of London, could 5 with ease have overpowered. These haughty princes were therefore under a restraint stronger than any which mere law can impose, under a restraint which did not, indeed, prevent them from sometimes treating an individual in an arbitrary and even in a barbarous 10 manner, but which effectually secured the nation against general and long continued oppression. They might safely be tyrants within the precinct of the court : but it was necessary for them to watch with constant anxiety the temper of the country. Henry 15 the Eighth, for example, encountered no opposition when he wished to send Buckingham and Surrey, Anne Boleyn and Lady Salisbury, to the scaffold. But when, without the consent of Parliament, he demanded of his subjects a contribution amounting 20 to one sixth of their goods, he soon found it necessary to retract. The cry of hundreds of thousands was that they were English and not French, freemen and not slaves. In Kent the royal commissioners fled for their lives. In Suffolk four thousand men appeared 25 in arms. The King's lieutenants in that county vainly exerted themselves to raise an army. Those who did not join in the insurrection declared that they would not fight against their brethren in such a quarrel. Henry, proud and selfwilled as he was, shrank, not 30 without reason, from a conflict with the roused spirit of the nation. He had before his eyes the fate of his predecessors who had perished at Berkeley and Pomfret. He not only cancelled his illegal commissions ; he not only granted a general pardon to all the male- 35 contents ; but he publicly and solemnly apologised for his infraction of the laws.

His conduct, on this occasion, well illustrates the whole policy of his house. The temper of the princes of that line was hot, and their spirit high : but they understood the character of the nation which they governed, and never once, like some of their predecessors, and some of their successors, carried obstinacy to a fatal point. The discretion of the Tudors was such, that their power, though it was often resisted, was never subverted. The reign of every one of them was disturbed by formidable discontents : 10 but the government was always able either to soothe the mutineers, or to conquer and punish them. Sometimes, by timely concessions, it succeeded in averting civil hostilities ; but in general it stood firm, and called for help on the nation. The nation obeyed 15 the call, rallied round the sovereign, and enabled him to quell the disaffected minority.

Thus, from the age of Henry the Third to the age of Elizabeth, England grew and flourished under a polity which contained the germ of our present 20 institutions, and which, though not very exactly defined, or very exactly observed, was yet effectually prevented from degenerating into despotism, by the awe in which the governors stood of the spirit and strength of the governed.

But such a polity is suited only to a particular 25 stage in the progress of society. The same causes which produce a division of labour in the peaceful arts must at length make war a distinct science and a distinct trade. A time arrives when the use of arms 30 begins to occupy the entire attention of a separate class. It soon appears that peasants and burghers, however brave, are unable to stand their ground against veteran soldiers, whose whole life is a preparation for the day of battle, whose nerves have 35 been braced by long familiarity with danger, and whose movements have all the precision of clockwork.

It is found that the defence of nations can no longer be safely entrusted to warriors taken from the plough or the loom for a campaign of forty days. If any state forms a great regular army, the bordering states must imitate the example, or must submit to a foreign yoke. But, where a great regular army exists, limited monarchy, such as it was in the middle ages, can exist no longer. The sovereign is at once emancipated from what had been the chief restraint on his power; and he inevitably becomes absolute, unless he is subjected to checks such as would be superfluous in a society where all are soldiers occasionally, and none permanently.

With the danger came also the means of escape. In the monarchies of the middle ages the power of the sword belonged to the prince; but the power of the purse belonged to the nation; and the progress of civilisation, as it made the sword of the prince more and more formidable to the nation, made the purse of the nation more and more necessary to the prince. His hereditary revenues would no longer suffice, even for the expenses of civil government. It was utterly impossible that, without a regular and extensive system of taxation, he could keep in constant efficiency a great body of disciplined troops. The policy which the parliamentary assemblies of Europe ought to have adopted was to take their stand firmly on their constitutional right to give or withhold money, and resolutely to refuse funds for the support of armies, till ample securities had been provided against despotism.

This wise policy was followed in our country alone. In the neighbouring kingdoms great military establishments were formed; no new safeguards for public liberty were devised; and the consequence was, that the old parliamentary institutions everywhere ceased to exist. In France, where they had

always been feeble, they languished, and at length died of mere weakness. In Spain, where they had been as strong as in any part of Europe, they struggled fiercely for life, but struggled too late. The mechanics of Toledo and Valladolid vainly 5 defended the privileges of the Castilian Cortes against the veteran battalions of Charles the Fifth. As vainly, in the next generation, did the citizens of Saragossa stand up against Philip the Second, for the old constitution of Aragon. One after another, the 10 great national councils of the continental monarchies, councils once scarcely less proud and powerful than those which sate at Westminster, sank into utter insignificance. If they met, they met merely as our Convocation now meets, to go through some venerable 15 forms.

In England events took a different course. This singular felicity she owed chiefly to her insular situation. Before the end of the fifteenth century great military establishments were indispensable to 20 the dignity, and even to the safety, of the French and Castilian monarchies. If either of those two powers had disarmed, it would soon have been compelled to submit to the dictation of the other. But England, protected by the sea against invasion, and 25 rarely engaged in warlike operations on the Continent, was not, as yet, under the necessity of employing regular troops. The sixteenth century, the seventeenth century, found her still without a standing army. At the commencement of the seventeenth century 30 political science had made considerable progress. The fate of the Spanish Cortes and of the French States General had given solemn warning to our Parliaments ; and our Parliaments, fully aware of the nature and magnitude of the danger, adopted, in good time, a system of 35 tactics which, after a contest protracted through three generations, was at length successful.

Almost every writer who has treated of that contest has been desirous to show that his own party was the party which was struggling to preserve the old constitution unaltered. The truth however is that the old constitution could not be preserved unaltered. 5 A law, beyond the control of human wisdom, had decreed that there should no longer be governments of that peculiar class which, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, had been common throughout 10 Europe. The question, therefore, was not whether our polity should undergo a change, but what the nature of the change should be. The introduction of a new and mighty force had disturbed the old equilibrium, and had turned one limited monarchy after another into an absolute monarchy. What had 15 happened elsewhere would assuredly have happened here, unless the balance had been redressed by a great transfer of power from the crown to the parliament. Our princes were about to have at their command means of coercion such as no Plantagenet 20 or Tudor had ever possessed. They must inevitably have become despots, unless they had been, at the same time, placed under restraints to which no Plantagenet or Tudor had ever been subject.

It seems certain, therefore, that, had none but 25 political causes been at work, the seventeenth century would not have passed away without a fierce conflict between our Kings and their Parliaments. But other causes of perhaps greater potency contributed to produce the same effect. While the government 30 of the Tudors was in its highest vigour an event took place which has coloured the destinies of all Christian nations, and in an especial manner the destinies of England. Twice during the middle ages the mind of Europe had risen up against the domination of Rome. 35 The first insurrection broke out in the south of France. The energy of Innocent the Third, the zeal

of the young orders of Francis and Dominic, and the ferocity of the Crusaders whom the priesthood let loose on an unwarlike population, crushed the Albigensian churches. The second reformation had its origin in England, and spread to Bohemia. The Council of Constance, by removing some ecclesiastical disorders which had given scandal to Christendom, and the princes of Europe, by unsparingly using fire and sword against the heretics, succeeded in arresting and turning back the movement. Nor is this much to be lamented. The sympathies of a Protestant, it is true, will naturally be on the side of the Albigensians and of the Lollards. Yet an enlightened and temperate Protestant will perhaps be disposed to doubt whether the success, either of the Albigensians or of the Lollards, would, on the whole, have promoted the happiness and virtue of mankind. Corrupt as the Church of Rome was, there is reason to believe that, if that Church had been overthrown in the twelfth or even in the fourteenth century, the vacant space would have been occupied by some system more corrupt still. There was then, through the greater part of Europe, very little knowledge; and that little was confined to the clergy. Not one man in five hundred could have spelled his way through a psalm. Books were few and costly. The art of printing was unknown. Copies of the Bible, inferior in beauty and clearness to those which every cottager may now command, sold for prices which many priests could not afford to give. It was obviously impossible that the laity should search the Scriptures for themselves. It is probable therefore, that, as soon as they had put off one spiritual yoke, they would have put on another, and that the power lately exercised by the clergy of the Church of Rome would have passed to a far worse class of teachers. The sixteenth century was comparatively a time of

light. Yet even in the sixteenth century a considerable number of those who quitted the old religion followed the first confident and plausible guide who offered himself, and were soon led into errors far more serious than those which they had renounced. 5 Thus Matthias and Kniperdoling, apostles of lust, robbery, and murder, were able for a time to rule great cities. In a darker age such false prophets might have founded empires ; and Christianity might have been distorted into a cruel and licentious superstition, more 10 noxious, not only than Popery, but even than Islamism.

About a hundred years after the rising of the Council of Constance, that great change emphatically called the Reformation began. The fulness of time was now come. The clergy were no longer the sole 15 or the chief depositories of knowledge. The invention of printing had furnished the assailants of the Church with a mighty weapon which had been wanting to their predecessors. The study of the ancient writers, the rapid development of the powers of the modern 20 languages, the unprecedented activity which was displayed in every department of literature, the political state of Europe, the vices of the Roman court, the exactions of the Roman chancery, the jealousy with which the wealth and privileges of the clergy were 25 naturally regarded by laymen, the jealousy with which the Italian ascendancy was naturally regarded by men born on our side of the Alps, all these things gave to the teachers of the new theology an advantage which they perfectly understood how to use. 30

Those who hold that the influence of the Church of Rome in the dark ages was, on the whole, beneficial to mankind may yet with perfect consistency regard the Reformation as an inestimable blessing. The leading strings, which preserve and uphold the infant, 35 would impede the fullgrown man. And so the very means by which the human mind is, in one stage of

its progress, supported and propelled, may, in another stage, be mere hindrances. There is a season in the life both of an individual and of a society, at which submission and faith, such as at a later period would be justly called servility and credulity, are useful 5 qualities. The child who teachably and undoubtedly listens to the instructions of his elders is likely to improve rapidly. But the man who should receive with childlike docility every assertion and dogma uttered by another man no wiser than himself would 10 become contemptible. It is the same with communities. The childhood of the European nations was passed under the tutelage of the clergy. The ascendancy of the sacerdotal order was long the ascendancy which naturally and properly belongs to 15 intellectual superiority. The priests, with all their faults, were by far the wisest portion of society. It was, therefore, on the whole, good that they should be respected and obeyed. The encroachments of the ecclesiastical power on the province of the civil 20 power produced much more happiness than misery, while the ecclesiastical power was in the hands of the only class that had studied history, philosophy, and public law, and while the civil power was in the hands of savage chiefs, who could not read their own 25 grants and edicts. But a change took place. Knowledge gradually spread among laymen. At the commencement of the sixteenth century many of them were in every intellectual attainment fully equal to the most enlightened of their spiritual 30 pastors. Thenceforward that dominion, which, during the dark ages, had been, in spite of many abuses, a legitimate and salutary guardianship, became an unjust and noxious tyranny.

From the time when the barbarians overran the 35 Western Empire to the time of the revival of letters, the influence of the Church of Rome had been

generally favourable to science, to civilisation, and to good government. But, during the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made in spite of her, and has everywhere been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor, while Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what, four hundred years ago, they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degradation, the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality, in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilisation. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru, and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada remain inert, while the whole continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise. The French have doubtless shown an energy and an intelligence which, even when misdirected, have justly entitled them to

be called a great people. But this apparent exception, when examined, will be found to confirm the rule ; for in no country that is called Roman Catholic, has the Roman Catholic Church, during several generations, possessed so little authority as in France. 5 The literature of France is justly held in high esteem throughout the world. But if we deduct from that literature all that belongs to four parties which have been, on different grounds, in rebellion against the Papal domination, all that belongs to the Protestants, 10 all that belongs to the assertors of the Gallican liberties, all that belongs to the Jansenists, and all that belongs to the philosophers, how much will be left ?

It is difficult to say whether England owes more to the Roman Catholic religion or to the Reformation. 15 For the amalgamation of races and for the abolition of villenage, she is chiefly indebted to the influence which the priesthood in the middle ages exercised over the laity. For political and intellectual freedom, and for all the blessings which political and in- 20 tellectual freedom have brought in their train, she is chiefly indebted to the great rebellion of the laity against the priesthood.

The struggle between the old and the new theology in our country was long, and the event 25 sometimes seemed doubtful. There were two extreme parties, prepared to act with violence or to suffer with stubborn resolution. Between them lay, during a considerable time, a middle party, which blended, very illogically, but by no means un- 30 naturally, lessons learned in the nursery with the sermons of the modern evangelists, and, while clinging with fondness to old observances, yet detested abuses with which those observances were closely connected. Men in such a frame of mind were 35 willing to obey, almost with thankfulness, the dictation of an able ruler who spared them the

trouble of judging for themselves, and, raising a firm and commanding voice above the uproar of controversy, told them how to worship and what to believe. It is not strange, therefore, that the Tudors should have been able to exercise a great influence on ecclesiastical affairs; nor is it strange that their influence should, for the most part, have been exercised with a view to their own interest. 5

Henry the Eighth attempted to constitute an Anglican Church differing from the Roman Catholic Church on the point of the supremacy, and on that point alone. His success in this attempt was extraordinary. The force of his character, the singularly favourable situation in which he stood with respect to foreign powers, the immense wealth which the spoliation of the abbeys placed at his disposal, and the support of that class which still halted between two opinions, enabled him to bid defiance to both the extreme parties, to burn as heretics those who avowed the tenets of the Reformers, and to hang as traitors those who owned the authority of the Pope. But Henry's system died with him. Had his life been prolonged, he would have found it difficult to maintain a position assailed with equal fury by all who were zealous either for the new or for the old opinions. The ministers who held the royal prerogatives in trust for his infant son could not venture to persist in so hazardous a policy; nor could Elizabeth venture to return to it. It was necessary to make a choice. The government must either submit to Rome, or must obtain the aid of the Protestants. The government and the Protestants had only one thing in common, hatred of the Papal power. The English Reformers were eager to go as far as their brethren on the Continent. They unanimously condemned as Antichristian numerous dogmas and practices to which Henry had stubbornly adhered, and which 10 15 20 25 30 35

Elizabeth reluctantly abandoned. Many felt a strong repugnance even to things indifferent which had formed part of the polity or ritual of the mystical Babylon. Thus Bishop Hooper, who died manfully at Gloucester for his religion, long refused to wear 5 the episcopal vestments. Bishop Ridley, a martyr of still greater renown, pulled down the ancient altars of his diocese, and ordered the Eucharist to be administered in the middle of churches, at tables which the Papists irreverently termed oyster boards. Bishop 10 Jewel pronounced the clerical garb to be a stage dress, a fool's coat, a relique of the Amorites, and promised that he would spare no labour to extirpate such degrading absurdities. Archbishop Grindal long hesitated about accepting a mitre from dislike of 15 what he regarded as the mummerly of consecration. Bishop Parkhurst uttered a fervent prayer that the Church of England would propose to herself the Church of Zurich as the absolute pattern of a Christian community. Bishop Ponet was of opinion 20 that the word Bishop should be abandoned to the Papists, and that the chief officers of the purified church should be called Superintendents. When it is considered that none of these prelates belonged to the extreme section of the Protestant party, it cannot 25 be doubted that, if the general sense of that party had been followed, the work of reform would have been carried on as unsparingly in England as in Scotland.

But, as the government needed the support of the 30 Protestants, so the Protestants needed the protection of the government. Much was therefore given up on both sides : an union was effected ; and the fruit of that union was the Church of England.

To the peculiarities of this great institution, and 35 to the strong passions which it has called forth in the minds both of friends and of enemies, are to be

attributed many of the most important events which have, since the Reformation, taken place in our country ; nor can the secular history of England be at all understood by us, unless we study it in constant connection with the history of her ecclesiastical 5 polity.

The man who took the chief part in settling the conditions of the alliance which produced the Anglican Church was Archbishop Cranmer. He was the representative of both the parties which, at that 10 time, needed each other's assistance. He was at once a divine and a courtier. In his character of divine he was perfectly ready to go as far in the way of change as any Swiss or Scottish Reformer. In his character of courtier he was desirous to preserve 15 that organisation which had, during many ages, admirably served the purposes of the Bishops of Rome, and might be expected now to serve equally well the purposes of the English Kings and of their ministers. His temper and his understanding 20 eminently fitted him to act as mediator. Saintly in his professions, unscrupulous in his dealings, zealous for nothing, bold in speculation, a coward and a timeserver in action, a placable enemy and a lukewarm friend, he was in every way qualified to 25 arrange the terms of the coalition between the religious and the worldly enemies of Popery.

To this day the constitution, the doctrines, and the services of the Church, retain the visible marks of the compromise from which she sprang. She occupies 30 a middle position between the Churches of Rome and Geneva. Her doctrinal confessions and discourses, composed by Protestants, set forth principles of theology in which Calvin or Knox would have found scarcely a word to disapprove. Her prayers and 35 thanksgivings, derived from the ancient Breviaries, are very generally such that Cardinal Fisher or

Cardinal Pole might have heartily joined in them. A controversialist who puts an Arminian sense on her Articles and Homilies will be pronounced by candid men to be as unreasonable as a controversialist who denies that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration 5 can be discovered in her Liturgy.

The Church of Rome held that episcopacy was of divine institution, and that certain supernatural graces of a high order had been transmitted by the imposition of hands through fifty generations, from the 10 Eleven who received their commission on the Galilean mount, to the bishops who met at Trent. A large body of Protestants, on the other hand, regarded prelacy as positively unlawful, and persuaded themselves that they found a very different form of ecclesiastical government prescribed in Scripture. 15 The founders of the Anglican Church took a middle course. They retained episcopacy ; but they did not declare it to be an institution essential to the welfare of a Christian society, or to the efficacy of the sacraments. 20 Cranmer, indeed, on one important occasion, plainly avowed his conviction that, in the primitive times, there was no distinction between bishops and priests, and that the laying on of hands was altogether superfluous. 25

Among the Presbyterians the conduct of public worship is, to a great extent, left to the minister. Their prayers, therefore, are not exactly the same in any two assemblies on the same day, or on any two days in the same assembly. In one parish they are 30 fervent, eloquent, and full of meaning. In the next parish they may be languid or absurd. The priests of the Roman Catholic Church, on the other hand, have, during many generations, daily chanted the same ancient confessions, supplications, and thanksgivings, in India and Lithuania, in Ireland and Peru. 35 The service, being in a dead language, is intelligible

only to the learned ; and the great majority of the congregation may be said to assist as spectators rather than as auditors. Here, again, the Church of England took a middle course. She copied the Roman Catholic forms of prayer, but translated them 5 into the vulgar tongue, and invited the illiterate multitude to join its voice to that of the minister.

In every part of her system the same policy may be traced. Utterly rejecting the doctrine of transubstantiation, and condemning as idolatrous all adoration 10 paid to the sacramental bread and wine, she yet, to the disgust of the Puritan, required her children to receive the memorials of divine love, meekly kneeling upon their knees. Discarding many rich vestments which surrounded the altars of the ancient faith, she 15 yet retained, to the horror of weak minds, a robe of white linen, typical of the purity which belonged to her as the mystical spouse of Christ. Discarding a crowd of pantomimic gestures which, in the Roman Catholic worship, are substituted for intelligible words, 20 she yet shocked many rigid Protestants by marking the infant just sprinkled from the font with the sign of the cross. The Roman Catholic addressed his prayers to a multitude of Saints, among whom were numbered many men of doubtful, and some of hateful, 25 character. The Puritan refused the addition of Saint even to the apostle of the Gentiles, and to the disciple whom Jesus loved. The Church of England, though she asked for the intercession of no created being, still set apart days for the commemoration of 30 some who had done and suffered great things for the faith. She retained confirmation and ordination as edifying rites ; but she degraded them from the rank of sacraments. Shrift was no part of her system. Yet she gently invited the dying penitent to confess 35 his sins to a divine, and empowered her ministers to soothe the departing soul by an absolution which

breathes the very spirit of the old religion. In general it may be said that she appeals more to the understanding, and less to the senses and the imagination, than the Church of Rome, and that she appeals less to the understanding, and more to the senses and imagination, than the Protestant Churches of Scotland, France, and Switzerland. 5

Nothing, however, so strongly distinguished the Church of England from other Churches as the relation in which she stood to the monarchy. The King was her head. The limits of the authority which he possessed, as such, were not traced, and indeed have never yet been traced, with precision. The laws which declared him supreme in ecclesiastical matters were drawn rudely and in general terms. If, for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of those laws, we examine the books and lives of those who founded the English Church, our perplexity will be increased. For the founders of the English Church wrote and acted in an age of violent intellectual fermentation, and of constant action and reaction. They therefore often contradicted each other, and sometimes contradicted themselves. That the King was, under Christ, sole head of the Church, was a doctrine which they all with one voice affirmed : but those words had very different significations in different mouths, and in the same mouth at different conjunctures. Sometimes an authority which would have satisfied Hildebrand was ascribed to the sovereign : then it dwindled down to an authority little more than that which had been claimed by many ancient English princes who had been in constant communion with the Church of Rome. What Henry and his favourite counsellors meant, at one time, by the supremacy, was certainly nothing less than the whole power of the keys. The King was to be the Pope of his kingdom, the vicar of God, the expositor of Catholic verity, the channel of 30 35

sacramental graces. He arrogated to himself the right of deciding dogmatically what was orthodox doctrine and what was heresy, of drawing up and imposing confessions of faith, and of giving religious instruction to his people. He proclaimed that all jurisdiction, spiritual as well as temporal, was derived from him alone, and that it was in his power to confer episcopal authority, and to take it away. He actually ordered his seal to be put to commissions by which bishops were appointed, who were to exercise their functions as his deputies, and during his pleasure. According to this system, as expounded by Cranmer, the King was the spiritual as well as the temporal chief of the nation. In both capacities His Highness must have lieutenants. As he appointed civil officers to keep his seal, to collect his revenues, and to dispense justice in his name, so he appointed divines of various ranks to preach the gospel, and to administer the sacraments. It was unnecessary that there should be any imposition of hands. The King,—such was the opinion of Cranmer given in the plainest words, —might, in virtue of authority derived from God, make a priest; and the priest so made needed no ordination whatever. These opinions the Archbishop, in spite of the opposition of less courtly divines, followed out to every legitimate consequence. He held that his own spiritual functions, like the secular functions of the Chancellor and Treasurer, were at once determined by a demise of the crown. When Henry died, therefore, the Primate and his suffragans took out fresh commissions, empowering them to ordain and to govern the Church till the new sovereign should think fit to order otherwise. When it was objected that a power to bind and to loose, altogether distinct from temporal power, had been given by our Lord to his apostles, some theologians of this school replied that the power to bind and to

loose had descended, not to the clergy, but to the whole body of Christian men, and ought to be exercised by the chief magistrate as the representative of the society. When it was objected that Saint Paul had spoken of certain persons whom the Holy Ghost had made overseers and shepherds of the faithful, it was answered that King Henry was the very overseer, the very shepherd, whom the Holy Ghost had appointed, and to whom the expressions of Saint Paul applied.¹

These high pretensions gave scandal to Protestants as well as to Catholics ; and the scandal was greatly increased when the supremacy, which Mary had resigned back to the Pope, was again annexed to the crown, on the accession of Elizabeth. It seemed monstrous that a woman should be the chief bishop of a Church in which an apostle had forbidden her even to let her voice be heard. The Queen, therefore, found it necessary expressly to disclaim that sacerdotal character which her father had assumed, and which, according to Cranmer, had been inseparably joined, by divine ordinance, to the regal function. When the Anglican confession of faith was revised in her reign, the supremacy was explained in a manner somewhat different from that which had been fashionable at the court of Henry. Cranmer had declared, in emphatic terms, that God had immediately committed to Christian princes the whole cure of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word for the cure of souls, as concerning the administration of things political.² The thirty-seventh article of religion, framed under Elizabeth, declares, in terms as emphatic, that the ministering of God's

¹ See a very curious paper which Strype believed to be in Gardiner's handwriting. Ecclesiastical Memorials, Book I. Chap. xvii.

² These are Cranmer's own words. See the Appendix to Burnet's History of the Reformation, Part I. Book III. No. 21. Question 9.

word does not belong to princes. The Queen, however, still had over the Church a visitatorial power of vast and undefined extent. She was entrusted by Parliament with the office of restraining and punishing heresy and every sort of ecclesiastical abuse, and was permitted to delegate her authority to commissioners. The Bishops were little more than her ministers. Rather than grant to the civil magistrate the absolute power of nominating spiritual pastors, the Church of Rome, in the eleventh century, set all Europe on fire. Rather than grant to the civil magistrate the absolute power of nominating spiritual pastors, the ministers of the Church of Scotland, in our time, resigned their livings by hundreds. The Church of England had no such scruples. By the royal authority alone her prelates were appointed. By the royal authority alone her Convocations were summoned, regulated, prorogued, and dissolved. Without the royal sanction her canons had no force. One of the articles of her faith was that without the royal consent no ecclesiastical council could lawfully assemble. From all her judicatures an appeal lay, in the last resort, to the sovereign, even when the question was whether an opinion ought to be accounted heretical, or whether the administration of a sacrament had been valid. Nor did the Church grudge this extensive power to our princes. By them she had been called into existence, nursed through a feeble infancy, guarded from Papists on one side and from Puritans on the other, protected against Parliaments which bore her no good will, and avenged on literary assailants whom she found it hard to answer. Thus gratitude, hope, fear, common attachments, common enmities, bound her to the throne. All her traditions, all her tastes, were monarchical. Loyalty became a point of professional honour among her clergy, the peculiar badge which distinguished them at once from Calvinists and from Papists. Both the

Calvinists and the Papists, widely as they differed in other respects, regarded with extreme jealousy all encroachments of the temporal power on the domain of the spiritual power. Both Calvinists and Papists maintained that subjects might justifiably draw the sword against ungodly rulers. In France Calvinists resisted Charles the Ninth : Papists resisted Henry the Fourth : both Papists and Calvinists resisted Henry the Third. In Scotland Calvinists led Mary captive. On the north of the Trent Papists took arms against the English throne. The Church of England meantime condemned both Calvinists and Papists, and loudly boasted that no duty was more constantly or earnestly inculcated by her than that of submission to princes.

The advantages which the crown derived from this close alliance with the Established Church were great ; but they were not without serious drawbacks. The compromise arranged by Cranmer had from the first been considered by a large body of Protestants as a scheme for serving two masters, as an attempt to unite the worship of the Lord with the worship of Baal. In the days of Edward the Sixth the scruples of this party had repeatedly thrown great difficulties in the way of the government. When Elizabeth came to the throne, those difficulties were much increased. Violence naturally engenders violence. The spirit of Protestantism was therefore far fiercer and more intolerant after the cruelties of Mary than before them. Many persons who were warmly attached to the new opinions had, during the evil days, taken refuge in Switzerland and Germany. They had been hospitably received by their brethren in the faith, had sate at the feet of the great doctors of Strasburg, Zurich, and Geneva, and had been, during some years, accustomed to a more simple worship, and to a more democratical form of church government, than

England had yet seen. These men returned to their country, convinced that the reform which had been effected under King Edward had been far less searching and extensive than the interests of pure religion required. But it was in vain that they attempted to obtain any concession from Elizabeth. Indeed her system, wherever it differed from her brother's, seemed to them to differ for the worse. They were little disposed to submit, in matters of faith, to any human authority. They had recently, in reliance on their own interpretation of Scripture, risen up against a Church strong in immemorial antiquity and catholic consent. It was by no common exertion of intellectual energy that they had thrown off the yoke of that gorgeous and imperial superstition ; and it was vain to expect that, immediately after such an emancipation, they would patiently submit to a new spiritual tyranny. Long accustomed, when the priest lifted up the host, to bow down with their faces to the earth, as before a present God, they had learned to treat the mass as an idolatrous mummery. Long accustomed to regard the Pope as the successor of the chief of the apostles, as the bearer of the keys of earth and heaven, they had learned to regard him as the Beast, the Antichrist, the Man of Sin. It was not to be expected that they would immediately transfer to an upstart authority the homage which they had withdrawn from the Vatican ; that they would submit their private judgment to the authority of a Church founded on private judgment alone ; that they would be afraid to dissent from teachers who themselves dissented from what had lately been the universal faith of western Christendom. It is easy to conceive the indignation which must have been felt by bold and inquisitive spirits, glorying in newly acquired freedom, when an institution younger by many years than themselves, an institution which had, under their

own eyes, gradually received its form from the passions and interests of a court, began to mimic the lofty style of Rome.

Since these men could not be convinced, it was determined that they should be persecuted. Persecution produced its natural effect on them. It found them a sect : it made them a faction. To their hatred of the Church was now added hatred of the Crown. The two sentiments were intermingled ; and each embittered the other. The opinions of the Puritan concerning the relation of ruler and subject were widely different from those which were inculcated in the Homilies. His favourite divines had, both by precept and by example, encouraged resistance to tyrants and persecutors. His fellow Calvinists in France, in Holland, and in Scotland, were in arms against idolatrous and cruel princes. His notions, too, respecting the government of the state took a tinge from his notions respecting the government of the Church. Some of the sarcasms which were popularly thrown on episcopacy might, without much difficulty, be turned against royalty ; and many of the arguments which were used to prove that spiritual power was best lodged in a synod seemed to lead to the conclusion that temporal power was best lodged in a parliament.

Thus, as the priest of the Established Church was, from interest, from principle, and from passion, zealous for the royal prerogatives, the Puritan was, from interest, from principle, and from passion, hostile to them. The power of the discontented sectaries was great. They were found in every rank ; but they were strongest among the mercantile classes in the towns, and among the small proprietors in the country. Early in the reign of Elizabeth they began to return a majority of the House of Commons. And doubtless, had our ancestors been then at liberty to fix their attention

entirely on domestic questions, the strife between the Crown and the Parliament would instantly have commenced. But that was no season for internal dissensions. It might, indeed, well be doubted whether the firmest union among all the orders of the state could 5 avert the common danger by which all were threatened. Roman Catholic Europe and reformed Europe were struggling for death or life. France, divided against herself, had, for a time, ceased to be of any account in Christendom. The English Government was at 10 the head of the Protestant interest, and, while persecuting Presbyterians at home, extended a powerful protection to Presbyterian Churches abroad. At the head of the opposite party was the mightiest prince of the age, a prince who ruled Spain, Portugal, Italy, 15 the Netherlands, the East and the West Indies, whose armies repeatedly marched to Paris, and whose fleets kept the coasts of Devonshire and Sussex in alarm. It long seemed probable that Englishmen would have to fight desperately on English ground for their religion 20 and independence. Nor were they ever for a moment free from apprehensions of some great treason at home. For in that age it had become a point of conscience and of honour with many men of generous natures to sacrifice their country to their religion. A 25 succession of dark plots, formed by Roman Catholics against the life of the Queen and the existence of the nation, kept society in constant alarm. Whatever might be the faults of Elizabeth, it was plain that, to speak humanly, the fate of the realm and of all re- 30 formed Churches was staked on the security of her person and on the success of her administration. To strengthen her hands was, therefore, the first duty of a patriot and a Protestant; and that duty was well performed. The Puritans, even in the depths of the 35 prisons to which she had sent them, prayed, and with no simulated fervour, that she might be kept from

the dagger of the assassin, that rebellion might be put down under her feet, and that her arms might be victorious by sea and land. One of the most stubborn of the stubborn sect, immediately after his hand had been lopped off for an offence into which he had been hurried by his intemperate zeal, waved his hat with the hand which was still left him, and shouted "God save the Queen!" The sentiment with which these men regarded her has descended to their posterity. The Nonconformists, rigorously as she treated them, have, as a body, always venerated her memory.¹

During the greater part of her reign, therefore, the Puritans in the House of Commons, though sometimes mutinous, felt no disposition to array themselves in systematic opposition to the government. But, when the defeat of the Armada, the successful resistance of the United Provinces to the Spanish power, the firm establishment of Henry the Fourth on the throne of France, and the death of Philip the Second, had secured the State and the Church against all danger from abroad, an obstinate struggle, destined to last during several generations, instantly began at home.

It was in the Parliament of 1601 that the opposition which had, during forty years, been silently gathering and husbanding strength, fought its first great battle and won its first victory. The ground was well chosen. The English sovereigns had always been entrusted with the supreme direction of

¹ The Puritan historian, Neal, after censuring the cruelty with which she treated the sect to which he belonged, concludes thus: "However, notwithstanding all these blemishes, Queen Elizabeth stands upon record as a wise and politic princess, for delivering her kingdom from the difficulties in which it was involved at her accession, for preserving the Protestant reformation against the potent attempts of the Pope, the Emperor, and King of Spain abroad, and the Queen of Scots and her Popish subjects at home. . . . She was the glory of the age in which she lived, and will be the admiration of posterity."—History of the Puritans, Part I. Chap. viii.

commercial police. It was their undoubted prerogative to regulate coin, weights, and measures, and to appoint fairs, markets, and ports. The line which bounded their authority over trade had, as usual, been but loosely drawn. They therefore, as usual, 5 encroached on the province which rightfully belonged to the legislature. The encroachment was, as usual, patiently borne, till it became serious. But at length the Queen took upon herself to grant patents of monopoly by scores. There was scarcely a family in 10 the realm which did not feel itself aggrieved by the oppression and extortion which this abuse naturally caused. Iron, oil, vinegar, coal, saltpetre, lead, starch, yarn, skins, leather, glass, could be bought only at exorbitant prices. The House of Commons met in 15 an angry and determined mood. It was in vain that a courtly minority blamed the Speaker for suffering the acts of the Queen's Highness to be called in question. The language of the discontented party was high and menacing, and was echoed by the voice 20 of the whole nation. The coach of the chief minister of the crown was surrounded by an indignant populace, who cursed the monopolies, and exclaimed that the prerogative should not be suffered to touch the old liberties of England. There seemed for a 25 moment to be some danger that the long and glorious reign of Elizabeth would have a shameful and disastrous end. She, however, with admirable judgment and temper, declined the contest, put herself at the head of the reforming party, redressed the 30 grievance, thanked the Commons, in touching and dignified language, for their tender care of the general weal, brought back to herself the hearts of the people, and left to her successors a memorable example of the way in which it behoves a ruler to deal with 35 public movements which he has not the means of resisting.

In the year 1603 the great Queen died. That year is, on many accounts, one of the most important epochs in our history. It was then that both Scotland and Ireland became parts of the same empire with England. Both Scotland and Ireland, indeed, had 5 been subjugated by the Plantagenets; but neither country had been patient under the yoke. Scotland had, with heroic energy, vindicated her independence, had, from the time of Robert Bruce, been a separate kingdom, and was now joined to the southern part of 10 the island in a manner which rather gratified than wounded her national pride. Ireland had never, since the days of Henry the Second, been able to expel the foreign invaders; but she had struggled against them long and fiercely. During the fourteenth and fifteenth 15 centuries the English power in that island was constantly declining, and, in the days of Henry the Seventh, sank to the lowest point. The Irish dominions of that prince consisted only of the counties of Dublin and Louth, of some parts of Meath and 20 Kildare, and of a few seaports scattered along the coast. A large portion even of Leinster was not yet divided into counties. Munster, Ulster, and Connaught were ruled by petty sovereigns, partly Celts, and partly degenerate Normans, who had forgotten 25 their origin and had adopted the Celtic language and manners. But, during the sixteenth century, the English power had made great progress. The half savage chieftains who reigned beyond the pale had submitted one after another to the lieutenants of the 30 Tudors. At length, a few weeks before the death of Elizabeth, the conquest, which had been begun more than four hundred years before by Strongbow, was completed by Mountjoy. Scarcely had James the First mounted the English throne when the last 35 O'Donnell and O'Neil who have held the rank of independent princes kissed his hand at Whitehall.

Thenceforward his writs ran and his judges held assizes in every part of Ireland ; and the English law superseded the customs which had prevailed among the aboriginal tribes.

In extent Scotland and Ireland were nearly equal to each other, and were together nearly equal to England, but were much less thickly peopled than England, and were very far behind England in wealth and civilisation. Scotland had been kept back by the sterility of her soil ; and, in the midst of light, the thick darkness of the middle ages still rested on Ireland.

The population of Scotland, with the exception of the Celtic tribes which were thinly scattered over the Hebrides and over the mountainous parts of the northern shires, was of the same blood with the population of England, and spoke a tongue which did not differ from the purest English more than the dialects of Somersetshire and Lancashire differed from each other. In Ireland, on the contrary, the population, with the exception of the small English colony near the coast, was Celtic, and still kept the Celtic speech and manners.

In natural courage and intelligence both the nations which now became connected with England ranked high. In perseverance, in self-command, in forethought, in all the virtues which conduce to success in life, the Scots have never been surpassed. The Irish, on the other hand, were distinguished by qualities which tend to make men interesting rather than prosperous. They were an ardent and impetuous race, easily moved to tears or to laughter, to fury or to love. Alone among the nations of northern Europe they had the susceptibility, the vivacity, the natural turn for acting and rhetoric, which are indigenous on the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. In mental cultivation Scotland had an indisputable

superiority. Though that kingdom was then the poorest in Christendom, it already vied in every branch of learning with the most favoured countries. Scotsmen, whose dwellings and whose food were as wretched as those of the Icelanders of our time, wrote 5 Latin verse with more than the delicacy of Vida, and made discoveries in science which would have added to the renown of Galileo. Ireland could boast of no Buchanan or Napier. The genius, with which her aboriginal inhabitants were largely endowed, showed 10 itself as yet only in ballads which, wild and rugged as they were, seemed to the judging eye of Spenser to contain a portion of the pure gold of poetry.

Scotland, in becoming part of the British monarchy, preserved her dignity. Having, during many genera- 15 tions, courageously withstood the English arms, she was now joined to her stronger neighbour on the most honourable terms. She gave a King instead of receiving one. She retained her own constitution and laws. Her tribunals and parliaments remained en- 20 tirely independent of the tribunals and parliaments which sate at Westminster. The administration of Scotland was in Scottish hands ; for no Englishman had any motive to emigrate northward, and to contend with the shrewdest and most pertinacious of all 25 races for what was to be scraped together in the poorest of all treasuries. Nevertheless Scotland by no means escaped the fate ordained for every country which is connected, but not incorporated, with another country of greater resources. Though in name an 30 independent kingdom, she was, during more than a century, really treated, in many respects, as a subject province.

Ireland was undisguisedly governed as a dependency won by the sword. Her rude national institu- 35 tions had perished. The English colonists submitted to the dictation of the mother country, without whose

support they could not exist, and indemnified themselves by trampling on the people among whom they had settled. The parliaments which met at Dublin could pass no law which had not been previously approved by the English Privy Council. The authority of the English legislature extended over Ireland. The executive administration was entrusted to men taken either from England or from the English pale, and, in either case, regarded as foreigners, and even as enemies, by the Celtic population. 10

But the circumstance which, more than any other, has made Ireland to differ from Scotland remains to be noticed. Scotland was Protestant. In no part of Europe had the movement of the popular mind against the Roman Catholic Church been so rapid and violent. The Reformers had vanquished, deposed, and imprisoned their idolatrous sovereign. They would not endure even such a compromise as had been effected in England. They had established the Calvinistic doctrine, discipline, and worship; and they made little distinction between Popery and Prelacy, between the Mass and the Book of Common Prayer. Unfortunately for Scotland, the prince whom she sent to govern a fairer inheritance had been so much annoyed by the pertinacity with which her theologians had asserted against him the privileges of the synod and the pulpit that he hated the ecclesiastical polity to which she was fondly attached as much as it was in his effeminate nature to hate anything, and had no sooner mounted the English throne than he began to show an intolerant zeal for the government and ritual of the English Church. ✓ 30

The Irish were the only people of northern Europe who had remained true to the old religion. This is to be partly ascribed to the circumstance that they were some centuries behind their neighbours in knowledge. But other causes had cooperated. The

Reformation had been a national as well as a moral revolt. It had been, not only an insurrection of the laity against the clergy, but also an insurrection of all the branches of the great German race against an alien domination. It is a most significant circumstance that no large society of which the tongue is not Teutonic has ever turned Protestant, and that, wherever a language derived from that of ancient Rome is spoken, the religion of modern Rome to this day prevails. The patriotism of the Irish had taken a peculiar direction. The object of their animosity was not Rome, but England; and they had especial reason to abhor those English sovereigns who had been the chiefs of the great schism, Henry the Eighth and Elizabeth. During the vain struggle which two generations of Milesian princes maintained against the Tudors, religious enthusiasm and national enthusiasm became inseparably blended in the minds of the vanquished race. The new feud of Protestant and Papist inflamed the old feud of Saxon and Celt. The English conquerors, meanwhile, neglected all legitimate means of conversion. No care was taken to provide the vanquished nation with instructors capable of making themselves understood. No translation of the Bible was put forth in the Irish language. The government contented itself with setting up a vast hierarchy of Protestant archbishops, bishops, and rectors, who did nothing, and who, for doing nothing, were paid out of the spoils of a Church loved and revered by the great body of the people.

There was much in the state both of Scotland and of Ireland which might well excite the painful apprehensions of a farsighted statesman. As yet, however, there was the appearance of tranquillity. For the first time all the British isles were peaceably united under one sceptre.

It should seem that the weight of England among

European nations ought, from this epoch, to have greatly increased. The territory which her new King governed was, in extent, nearly double that which Elizabeth had inherited. His empire was the most complete within itself and the most secure from attack that was to be found in the world. The Plantagenets and Tudors had been repeatedly under the necessity of defending themselves against Scotland while they were engaged in continental war. The long conflict in Ireland had been a severe and perpetual drain on their resources. Yet even under such disadvantages those sovereigns had been highly considered throughout Christendom. It might, therefore, not unreasonably be expected that England, Scotland, and Ireland combined would form a state second to none that then existed.

All such expectations were strangely disappointed. On the day of the accession of James the First England descended from the rank which she had hitherto held, and began to be regarded as a power hardly of the second order. During many years the great British monarchy, under four successive princes of the House of Stuart, was scarcely a more important member of the European system than the little kingdom of Scotland had previously been. This, however, is little to be regretted. Of James the First, as of John, it may be said that, if his administration had been able and splendid, it would probably have been fatal to our country, and that we owe more to his weakness and meanness than to the wisdom and courage of much better sovereigns. He came to the throne at a critical moment. The time was fast approaching when either the King must become absolute, or the Parliament must control the whole executive administration. Had James been, like Henry the Fourth, like Maurice of Nassau, or like Gustavus Adolphus, a valiant, active, and politic

ruler, had he put himself at the head of the Protestants of Europe, had he gained great victories over Tilly and Spinola, had he adorned Westminster with the spoils of Bavarian monasteries and Flemish cathedrals, had he hung Austrian and Castilian banners in Saint Paul's, and had he found himself, after great achievements, at the head of fifty thousand troops, brave, well disciplined, and devotedly attached to his person, the English Parliament would soon have been nothing more than a name. Happily he was not a man to play such a part. He began his administration by putting an end to the war which had raged during many years between England and Spain; and from that time he shunned hostilities with a caution which was proof against the insults of his neighbours and the clamours of his subjects. Not till the last year of his life could the influence of his son, his favourite, his Parliament, and his people combined, induce him to strike one feeble blow in defence of his family and of his religion. It was well for those whom he governed that he in this matter disregarded their wishes. The effect of his pacific policy was that, in his time, no regular troops were needed, and that, while France, Spain, Italy, Belgium, and Germany swarmed with mercenary soldiers, the defence of our island was still confided to the militia.

As the King had no standing army, and did not even attempt to form one, it would have been wise in him to avoid any conflict with his people. But such was his indiscretion that, while he altogether neglected the means which alone could make him really absolute, he constantly put forward, in the most offensive form, claims of which none of his predecessors had ever dreamed. It was at this time that those strange theories which Filmer afterwards formed into a system, and which became the badge of the most violent class of Tories and high churchmen, first

emerged into notice. It was gravely maintained that the Supreme Being regarded hereditary monarchy, as opposed to other forms of government, with peculiar favour ; that the rule of succession in order of primogeniture was a divine institution, anterior to the Christian, and even to the Mosaic dispensation ; that no human power, not even that of the whole legislature, no length of adverse possession, though it extended to ten centuries, could deprive a legitimate prince of his rights ; that the authority of such a prince was necessarily always despotic ; that the laws, by which, in England and in other countries, the prerogative was limited, were to be regarded merely as concessions which the sovereign had freely made and might at his pleasure resume ; and that any treaty which a king might conclude with his people was merely a declaration of his present intentions, and not a contract of which the performance could be demanded. It is evident that this theory, though intended to strengthen the foundations of government, altogether unsettles them. Does the divine and immutable law of primogeniture admit females, or exclude them ? On either supposition half the sovereigns of Europe must be usurpers, reigning in defiance of the law of God, and liable to be dispossessed by the rightful heirs. The doctrine that kingly government is peculiarly favoured by Heaven receives no countenance from the Old Testament ; for in the Old Testament we read that the chosen people were blamed and punished for desiring a king, and that they were afterwards commanded to withdraw their allegiance from him. Their whole history, far from countenancing the notion that succession in order of primogeniture is of divine institution, would rather seem to indicate that younger brothers are under the especial protection of heaven. Isaac was not the eldest son of Abraham, nor Jacob of Isaac,

nor Judah of Jacob, nor David of Jesse, nor Solomon of David. Nor does the system of Filmer receive any countenance from those passages of the New Testament which describe government as an ordinance of God : for the government under which the writers 5 of the New Testament lived was not a hereditary monarchy. The Roman Emperors were republican magistrates, named by the senate. None of them pretended to rule by right of birth ; and, in fact, both Tiberius, to whom Christ commanded that tribute 10 should be given, and Nero, whom Paul directed the Romans to obey, were, according to the patriarchal theory of government, usurpers. In the middle ages the doctrine of indefeasible hereditary right would have been regarded as heretical : for it was altogether 15 incompatible with the high pretensions of the Church of Rome. It was a doctrine unknown to the founders of the Church of England. The Homily on Wilful Rebellion had strongly, and indeed too strongly, inculcated submission to constituted authority, but had 20 made no distinction between hereditary and elective monarchies, or between monarchies and republics. Indeed most of the predecessors of James would, from personal motives, have regarded the patriarchal theory of government with aversion. William Rufus, 25 Henry the First, Stephen, John, Henry the Fourth, Henry the Fifth, Henry the Sixth, Richard the Third, and Henry the Seventh, had all reigned in defiance of the strict rule of descent. A grave doubt hung over the legitimacy both of Mary and of Elizabeth. 30 It was impossible that both Catharine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn could have been lawfully married to Henry the Eighth ; and the highest authority in the realm had pronounced that neither was so. The Tudors, far from considering the law of succession as 35 a divine and unchangeable institution, were constantly tampering with it. Henry the Eighth obtained an

act of parliament, giving him power to leave the crown by will, and actually made a will to the prejudice of the royal family of Scotland. Edward the Sixth, unauthorised by Parliament, assumed a similar power, with the full approbation of the most eminent Reformers. Elizabeth, conscious that her own title was open to grave objection, and unwilling to admit even a reversionary right in her rival and enemy the Queen of Scots, induced the Parliament to pass a law, enacting that whoever should deny the competency of the reigning sovereign, with the assent of the Estates of the realm, to alter the succession, should suffer death as a traitor. But the situation of James was widely different from that of Elizabeth. Far inferior to her in abilities and in popularity, regarded by the English as an alien, and excluded from the throne by the testament of Henry the Eighth, the King of Scots was yet the undoubted heir of William the Conqueror and of Egbert. He had, therefore, an obvious interest in inculcating the superstitious notion that birth confers rights anterior to law, and unalterable by law. It was a notion, moreover, well suited to his intellect and temper. It soon found many advocates among those who aspired to his favour, and made rapid progress among the clergy of the Established Church.

Thus, at the very moment at which a republican spirit began to manifest itself strongly in the Parliament and in the country, the claims of the monarch took a monstrous form which would have disgusted the proudest and most arbitrary of those who had preceded him on the throne.

James was always boasting of his skill in what he called kingcraft; and yet it is hardly possible even to imagine a course more directly opposed to all the rules of kingcraft than that which he followed. The policy of wise rulers has always been to disguise strong acts

under popular forms. It was thus that Augustus and Napoleon established absolute monarchies, while the public regarded them merely as eminent citizens invested with temporary magistracies. The policy of James was the direct reverse of theirs. He enraged 5 and alarmed his Parliament by constantly telling them that they held their privileges merely during his pleasure, and that they had no more business to inquire what he might lawfully do than what the Deity might lawfully do. Yet he quailed before 10 them, abandoned minister after minister to their vengeance, and suffered them to tease him into acts directly opposed to his strongest inclinations. Thus the indignation excited by his claims and the scorn excited by his concessions went on growing together. 15 By his fondness for worthless minions, and by the sanction which he gave to their tyranny and rapacity, he kept discontent constantly alive. His cowardice, his childishness, his pedantry, his ungainly person and manners, his provincial accent, made him an object of 20 derision. Even in his virtues and accomplishments there was something eminently unkingly. Throughout the whole course of his reign, all the venerable associations by which the throne had long been fenced were gradually losing their strength. During two hundred 25 years all the sovereigns who had ruled England, with the single exception of the unfortunate Henry the Sixth, had been strongminded, highspirited, courageous, and of princely bearing. Almost all had possessed abilities above the ordinary level. It was 30 no light thing that, on the very eve of the decisive struggle between our Kings and their Parliaments, royalty should be exhibited to the world stammering, slobbering, shedding unmanly tears, trembling at a drawn sword, and talking in the style alternately of a 35 buffoon and of a pedagogue.

In the meantime the religious dissensions, by

which, from the days of Edward the Sixth, the Protestant body had been distracted, had become more formidable than ever. The interval which had separated the first generation of Puritans from Cranmer and Jewel was small indeed when compared with 5 the interval which separated the third generation of Puritans from Laud and Hammond. While the recollection of Mary's cruelties was still fresh, while the powers of the Roman Catholic party still inspired apprehension, while Spain still retained ascendancy 10 and aspired to universal dominion, all the reformed sects knew that they had a strong common interest and a deadly common enemy. The animosity which they felt towards each other was languid when compared with the animosity which they all felt towards 15 Rome. Conformists and Nonconformists had heartily joined in enacting penal laws of extreme severity against the Papists. But when more than half a century of undisturbed possession had given confidence to the Established Church, when nine tenths of the 20 nation had become heartily Protestant, when England was at peace with all the world, when there was no danger that Popery would be forced by foreign arms on the nation, when the last confessors who had stood before Bonner had passed away, a change took place 25 in the feeling of the Anglican clergy. Their hostility to the Roman Catholic doctrine and discipline was considerably mitigated. Their dislike of the Puritans, on the other hand, increased daily. The controversies which had from the beginning divided the Protestant 30 party took such a form as made reconciliation hopeless ; and new controversies of still greater importance were added to the old subjects of dispute.

The founders of the Anglican Church had retained episcopacy as an ancient, a decent, and a convenient 35 ecclesiastical polity, but had not declared that form of church government to be of divine institution. We

have already seen how low an estimate Cranmer had formed of the office of a Bishop. In the reign of Elizabeth, Jewel, Cooper, Whitgift, and other eminent doctors defended prelacy, as innocent, as useful, as what the state might lawfully establish, as what, when 5 established by the state, was entitled to the respect of every citizen. But they never denied that a Christian community without a Bishop might be a pure Church.¹ On the contrary, they regarded the Protestants of the Continent as of the same household of faith with 10 themselves. Englishmen in England were indeed bound to acknowledge the authority of the Bishop, as they were bound to acknowledge the authority of the Sheriff and of the Coroner: but the obligation was purely local. An English churchman, nay even an 15 English prelate, if he went to Holland, conformed without scruple to the established religion of Holland. Abroad the ambassadors of Elizabeth and James went in state to the very worship which Elizabeth and James persecuted at home, and carefully abstained 20

¹ On this subject, Bishop Cooper's language is remarkably clear and strong. He maintains, in his Answer to Martin Marprelate, printed in 1589, that no form of church government is divinely ordained; that Protestant communities, in establishing different forms, have only made a legitimate use of their Christian liberty; and that episcopacy is peculiarly suited to England, because the English constitution is monarchical. "All those Churches," says the Bishop, "in which the Gospell, in these daies, after great darknesse, was first renewed, and the learned men whom God sent to instruct them, I doubt not but have been directed by the Spirite of God to retaine this liberty, that, in external government and other outward orders, they might choose such as they thought in wisdom and godlinesse to be most convenient for the state of their countrey and disposition of their people. Why then should this liberty that other countreys have used under any colour be wrested from us? I think it therefore great presumption and boldnesse that some of our nation, and those, whatever they may think of themselves, not of the greatest wisdom and skill, should take upon them to controule the whole realme, and to binde both prince and people in respect of conscience to alter the present state, and tie themselves to a certain platforme devised by some of our neighbours, which, in the judgment of many wise and godly persons, is most unfit for the state of a Kingdome."

from decorating their private chapels after the Anglican fashion, lest scandal should be given to weaker brethren. An instrument is still extant by which the Primate of all England, in the year 1582, authorised a Scotch minister, ordained, according to the laudable forms of the Scotch Church, by the Synod of East Lothian, to preach and administer the sacraments in any part of the province of Canterbury.¹ In the year 1603, the Convocation solemnly recognised the Church of Scotland, a Church in which episcopal control and episcopal ordination were then unknown, as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ.² It was even held that Presbyterian ministers were entitled to place and voice in œcumenical councils. When the States General of the United Provinces convoked at Dort a synod of doctors not episcopally ordained, an English Bishop and an English Dean, commissioned by the head of the English Church, sate with those doctors, preached to them, and voted with them on the gravest questions of theology.³ Nay, many English benefices were held by divines who had been admitted to the ministry in the Calvinistic form used on the Continent; nor was reordination by a Bishop in such cases then thought necessary, or even lawful.⁴

¹ Strype's *Life of Grindal*, Appendix to Book II. No. xvii.

² Canon 55. of 1603.

³ Joseph Hall, then dean of Worcester, and afterwards bishop of Norwich, was one of the commissioners. In his life of himself, he says: "My unworthiness was named for one of the assistants of that honourable, grave, and reverend meeting." To high churchmen this humility will seem not a little out of place.

⁴ It was by the Act of Uniformity, passed after the Restoration, that persons not episcopally ordained were, for the first time, made incapable of holding benefices. No man was more zealous for this law than Clarendon. Yet he says: "This was new; for there had been many, and at present there were some, who possessed benefices with cure of souls and other ecclesiastical promotions, who had never received orders but in France or Holland; and these men must now receive new ordination, which had been always held unlawful in the Church, or by this act of parliament must be deprived of their liveli-

But a new race of divines was already rising in the Church of England. In their view the episcopal office was essential to the welfare of a Christian society and to the efficacy of the most solemn ordinances of religion. To that office belonged certain 5 high and sacred privileges, which no human power could give or take away. A Church might as well be without the doctrine of the Trinity, or the doctrine of the Incarnation, as without the apostolical orders; and the Church of Rome, which, in the midst of all 10 her corruptions, had retained the apostolical orders, was nearer to primitive purity than those reformed societies which had rashly set up, in opposition to the divine model, a system invented by men.

In the days of Edward the Sixth and of Elizabeth, 15 the defenders of the Anglican ritual had generally contented themselves with saying that it might be used without sin, and that, therefore, none but a perverse and undutiful subject would refuse to use it when enjoined to do so by the magistrate. Now, 20 however, that rising party which claimed for the polity of the Church a celestial origin began to ascribe to her services a new dignity and importance. It was hinted that, if the established worship had any fault, that fault was extreme simplicity, and that the 25 Reformers had, in the heat of their quarrel with Rome, abolished many ancient ceremonies which might with advantage have been retained. Days and places were again held in mysterious veneration. Some practices which had long been disused, and 30 which were commonly regarded as superstitious mummeries, were revived. Paintings and carvings, which had escaped the fury of the first generation of Protestants, became the objects of a respect such as to many seemed idolatrous. 35

hood which they enjoyed in the most flourishing and peaceable time of the Church."

No part of the system of the old Church had been more detested by the Reformers than the honour paid to celibacy. They held that the doctrine of Rome on this subject had been prophetically condemned by the apostle Paul, as a doctrine of devils ; 5 and they dwelt much on the crimes and scandals which seemed to prove the justice of this awful denunciation. Luther had evinced his own opinion in the clearest manner, by espousing a nun. Some of the most illustrious bishops and priests who had died 10 by fire during the reign of Mary had left wives and children. Now, however, it began to be rumoured that the old monastic spirit had reappeared in the Church of England ; that there was in high quarters a prejudice against married priests ; that even laymen, 15 who called themselves Protestants, had made resolutions of celibacy which almost amounted to vows ; nay, that a minister of the established religion had set up a nunnery, in which the psalms were chaunted at midnight, by a company of virgins dedicated to 20 God.¹

Nor was this all. A class of questions, as to which the founders of the Anglican Church and the first generation of Puritans had differed little or not at all, began to furnish matter for fierce disputes. The 25 controversies which had divided the Protestant body in its infancy had related almost exclusively to Church government and to ceremonies. There had been no serious quarrel between the contending parties on points of metaphysical theology. The doctrines held 30 by the chiefs of the hierarchy touching original sin, faith, grace, predestination, and election, were those which are popularly called Calvinistic. Towards the close of Elizabeth's reign her favourite prelate, Arch-

¹ Peckard's *Life of Ferrar* ; The Arminian Nunnery, or a Brief Description of the late erected monastical Place called the Arminian Nunnery, at Little Gidding in Huntingdonshire, 1641.

bishop Whitgift, drew up, in concert with the Bishop of London and other theologians, the celebrated instrument known by the name of the Lambeth Articles. In that instrument the most startling of the Calvinistic doctrines are affirmed with a distinct-
ness which would shock many who, in our age, are
reputed Calvinists. One clergyman, who took the
opposite side, and spoke harshly of Calvin, was
arraigned for his presumption by the University of
Cambridge, and escaped punishment only by express-
ing his firm belief in the tenets of reprobation and
final perseverance, and his sorrow for the offence
which he had given to pious men by reflecting on
the great French reformer. The school of divinity
of which Hooker was the chief occupies a middle
place between the school of Cranmer and the school
of Laud; and Hooker has, in modern times, been
claimed by the Arminians as an ally. Yet Hooker
pronounced Calvin to have been a man superior in
wisdom to any other divine that France had produced,
a man to whom thousands were indebted for the
knowledge of divine truth, but who was himself
indebted to God alone. When the Arminian contro-
versy arose in Holland, the English government and
the English Church lent strong support to the
Calvinistic party; nor is the English name altogether
free from the stain which has been left on that party
by the imprisonment of Grotius and the judicial
murder of Barneveldt.

But, even before the meeting of the Dutch synod, that part of the Anglican clergy which was peculiarly hostile to the Calvinistic Church government and to the Calvinistic worship had begun to regard with dislike the Calvinistic metaphysics; and this feeling was very naturally strengthened by the gross injustice, insolence, and cruelty of the party which was prevalent at Dort. The Arminian doctrine, a doctrine less

austerely logical than that of the early Reformers, but more agreeable to the popular notions of the divine justice and benevolence, spread fast and wide. The infection soon reached the court. Opinions which, at the time of the accession of James, no clergyman could have avowed without imminent risk of being stripped of his gown, were now the best title to preferment. A divine of that age, who was asked by a simple country gentleman what the Arminians held, answered, with as much truth as wit, that they held all the best bishoprics and deaneries in England.

While the majority of the Anglican clergy quitted, in one direction, the position which they had originally occupied, the majority of the Puritan body departed, in a direction diametrically opposite, from the principles and practices of their fathers. The persecution which the separatists had undergone had been severe enough to irritate, but not severe enough to destroy. They had been, not tamed into submission, but baited into savageness and stubbornness. After the fashion of oppressed sects, they mistook their own vindictive feelings for emotions of piety, encouraged in themselves by reading and meditation a disposition to brood over their wrongs, and, when they had worked themselves up into hating their enemies, imagined that they were only hating the enemies of heaven. In the New Testament there was little indeed which, even when perverted by the most disingenuous exposition, could seem to countenance the indulgence of malevolent passions. But the Old Testament contained the history of a race selected by God to be witnesses of his unity and ministers of his vengeance, and specially commanded by him to do many things which, if done without his special command, would have been atrocious crimes. In such a history it was not difficult for fierce and gloomy spirits to find much that might be distorted

to suit their wishes. The extreme Puritans therefore began to feel for the Old Testament a preference, which, perhaps, they did not distinctly avow even to themselves ; but which showed itself in all their sentiments and habits. They paid to the Hebrew language a respect which they refused to that tongue in which the discourses of Jesus and the epistles of Paul have come down to us. They baptized their children by the names, not of Christian saints, but of Hebrew patriarchs and warriors. In defiance of the express and reiterated declarations of Luther and Calvin, they turned the weekly festival by which the Church had, from the primitive times, commemorated the resurrection of her Lord, into a Jewish Sabbath. They sought for principles of jurisprudence in Mosaic law, and for precedents to guide their ordinary conduct in the books of Judges and Kings. Their thoughts and discourse ran much on acts which were assuredly not recorded as examples for our imitation. The prophet who hewed in pieces a captive king, the rebel general who gave the blood of a queen to the dogs, the matron who, in defiance of plighted faith, and of the laws of eastern hospitality, drove the nail into the brain of the fugitive ally who had just fed at her board, and who was sleeping under the shadow of her tent, were proposed as models to Christians suffering under the tyranny of princes and prelates. Morals and manners were subjected to a code resembling that of the synagogue, when the synagogue was in its worst state. The dress, the deportment, the language, the studies, the amusements of the rigid sect were regulated on principles not unlike those of the Pharisees who, proud of their washed hands and broad phylacteries, taunted the Redeemer as a sabbathbreaker and a winebibber. It was a sin to hang garlands on a Maypole, to drink a friend's health. to fly a hawk, to hunt a stag, to play at chess,

to wear lovelocks, to put starch into a ruff, to touch the virginals, to read the Fairy Queen. Rules such as these, rules which would have appeared insupportable to the free and joyous spirit of Luther, and contemptible to the serene and philosophical intellect of Zwingle, threw over all life a more than monastic gloom. The learning and eloquence by which the great Reformers had been eminently distinguished, and to which they had been, in no small measure, indebted for their success, were regarded by the new school of Protestants with suspicion, if not with aversion. Some precisians had scruples about teaching the Latin grammar, because the names of Mars, Bacchus, and Apollo occurred in it. The fine arts were all but proscribed. The solemn peal of the organ was superstitious. The light music of Ben Jonson's masques was dissolute. Half the fine paintings in England were idolatrous, and the other half indecent. The extreme Puritan was at once known from other men by his gait, his garb, his lank hair, the sour solemnity of his face, the upturned white of his eyes, the nasal twang with which he spoke, and above all, by his peculiar dialect. He employed, on every occasion, the imagery and style of Scripture. Hebraisms violently introduced into the English language, and metaphors borrowed from the boldest lyric poetry of a remote age and country, and applied to the common concerns of English life, were the most striking peculiarities of this cant, which moved, not without cause, the derision both of Prelatists and libertines.

Thus the political and religious schism which had originated in the sixteenth century was, during the first quarter of the seventeenth century, constantly widening. Theories tending to Turkish despotism were in fashion at Whitehall. Theories tending to republicanism were in favour with a large portion of

the House of Commons. The violent Prelatists who were, to a man, zealous for prerogative, and the violent Puritans who were, to a man, zealous for the privileges of Parliament, regarded each other with animosity more intense than that which, in the preceding generation, had existed between Catholics and Protestants. 5

While the minds of men were in this state, the country, after a peace of many years, at length engaged in a war which required strenuous exertions. 10 This war hastened the approach of the great constitutional crisis. It was necessary that the King should have a large military force. He could not have such a force without money. He could not legally raise money without the consent of Parliament. 15 It followed, therefore, that he either must administer the government in conformity with the sense of the House of Commons, or must venture on such a violation of the fundamental laws of the land as had been unknown during several centuries. The Plantagenets 20 and the Tudors had, it is true, occasionally supplied a deficiency in their revenue by a benevolence or a forced loan : but these expedients were always of a temporary nature. To meet the regular charge of a long war by regular taxation, imposed without the 25 consent of the Estates of the realm, was a course which Henry the Eighth himself would not have dared to take. It seemed, therefore, that the decisive hour was approaching, and that the English Parliament would soon either share the fate of the senates 30 of the Continent, or obtain supreme ascendancy in the state.

Just at this conjuncture James died. Charles the First succeeded to the throne. He had received from nature a far better understanding, a far stronger 35 will, and a far keener and firmer temper than his father's. He had inherited his father's political

theories, and was much more disposed than his father to carry them into practice. He was, like his father, a zealous Episcopalian. He was, moreover, what his father had never been, a zealous Arminian, and, though no Papist, liked a Papist much better than a Puritan. It would be unjust to deny that Charles had some of the qualities of a good, and even of a great prince. He wrote and spoke, not, like his father, with the exactness of a professor, but after the fashion of intelligent and well educated gentlemen. His taste in literature and art was excellent, his manner dignified, though not gracious, his domestic life without blemish. Faithlessness was the chief cause of his disasters, and is the chief stain on his memory. He was, in truth, impelled by an incurable propensity to dark and crooked ways. It may seem strange that his conscience, which, on occasions of little moment, was sufficiently sensitive, should never have reproached him with this great vice. But there is reason to believe that he was perfidious, not only from constitution and from habit, but also on principle. He seems to have learned from the theologians whom he most esteemed that between him and his subjects there could be nothing of the nature of mutual contract; that he could not, even if he would, divest himself of his despotic authority; and that, in every promise which he made, there was an implied reservation that such promise might be broken in case of necessity, and that of the necessity he was the sole judge.

And now began that hazardous game on which were staked the destinies of the English people. It was played on the side of the House of Commons with keenness, but with admirable dexterity, coolness, and perseverance. Great statesmen who looked far behind them and far before them were at the head of that assembly. They were resolved to place the King in such a situation that he must either conduct

the administration in conformity with the wishes of his Parliament, or make outrageous attacks on the most sacred principles of the constitution. They accordingly doled out supplies to him very sparingly. He found that he must govern either in harmony 5 with the House of Commons, or in defiance of all law. His choice was soon made. He dissolved his first Parliament, and levied taxes by his own authority. He convoked a second Parliament, and found it more intractable than the first. He again resorted to the 10 expedient of dissolution, raised fresh taxes without any show of legal right, and threw the chiefs of the opposition into prison. At the same time a new grievance, which the peculiar feelings and habits of the English nation made insupportably painful, and 15 which seemed to all discerning men to be of fearful augury, excited general discontent and alarm. Companies of soldiers were billeted on the people: and martial law was, in some places, substituted for the ancient jurisprudence of the realm. 20

The King called a third Parliament, and soon perceived that the opposition was stronger and fiercer than ever. He now determined on a change of tactics. Instead of opposing an inflexible resistance to the demands of the Commons, he, after much 25 altercation and many evasions, agreed to a compromise which, if he had faithfully adhered to it, would have averted a long series of calamities. The Parliament granted an ample supply. The King ratified, in the most solemn manner, that celebrated 30 law, which is known by the name of the Petition of Right, and which is the second Great Charter of the liberties of England. By ratifying that law he bound himself never again to raise money without the consent of the Houses, never again to imprison any per- 35 son, except in due course of law, and never again to subject his people to the jurisdiction of courts martial.

The day on which the royal sanction was, after many delays, solemnly given to this great Act, was a day of joy and hope. The Commons, who crowded the bar of the House of Lords, broke forth into loud acclamations as soon as the clerk had pronounced the 5 ancient form of words by which our princes have, during many ages, signified their assent to the wishes of the Estates of the realm. Those acclamations were reechoed by the voice of the capital and of the nation; but within three weeks it became manifest 10 that Charles had no intention of observing the compact into which he had entered. The supply given by the representatives of the nation was collected. The promise by which that supply had been obtained was broken. A violent contest followed. The Par- 15 liament was dissolved with every mark of royal displeasure. Some of the most distinguished members were imprisoned: and one of them, Sir John Eliot, after years of suffering, died in confinement.

Charles, however, could not venture to raise, by his 20 own authority, taxes sufficient for carrying on war. He accordingly hastened to make peace with his neighbours, and thenceforth gave his whole mind to British politics.

Now commenced a new era. Many English 25 Kings had occasionally committed unconstitutional acts: but none had ever systematically attempted to make himself a despot, and to reduce the Parliament to a nullity. Such was the end which Charles distinctly proposed to himself. From March 1629 to 30 April 1640, the Houses were not convoked. Never in our history had there been an interval of eleven years between Parliament and Parliament. Only once had there been an interval of even half that length. This fact alone is sufficient to refute those who 35 represent Charles as having merely trodden in the footsteps of the Plantagenets and Tudors,

It is proved, by the testimony of the King's most strenuous supporters, that, during this part of his reign, the provisions of the Petition of Right were violated by him, not occasionally, but constantly, and on system; that a large part of the revenue was raised without any legal authority; and that persons obnoxious to the government languished for years in prison, without being ever called upon to plead before any tribunal.

For these things history must hold the King himself chiefly responsible. From the time of his third Parliament he was his own prime minister. Several persons, however, whose temper and talents were suited to his purposes, were at the head of different departments of the administration.

Thomas Wentworth, successively created Lord Wentworth and Earl of Strafford, a man of great abilities, eloquence, and courage, but of a cruel and imperious nature, was the counsellor most trusted in political and military affairs. He had been one of the most distinguished members of the opposition, and felt towards those whom he had deserted that peculiar malignity which has, in all ages, been characteristic of apostates. He perfectly understood the feelings, the resources, and the policy of the party to which he had lately belonged, and had formed a vast and deeply meditated scheme which very nearly confounded even the able tactics of the statesmen by whom the House of Commons had been directed. To this scheme, in his confidential correspondence, he gave the expressive name of Thorough. His object was to do in England all, and more than all, that Richelieu was doing in France; to make Charles a monarch as absolute as any on the Continent; to put the estates and the personal liberty of the whole people at the disposal of the crown; to deprive the courts of law of all independent authority, even in

ordinary questions of civil right between man and man ; and to punish with merciless rigour all who murmured at the acts of the government, or who applied, even in the most decent and regular manner, to any tribunal for relief against those acts.¹

This was his end ; and he distinctly saw in what manner alone this end could be attained. There was, in truth, about all his notions a clearness, a coherence, a precision, which, if he had not been pursuing an object pernicious to his country and to his kind, 10 would have justly entitled him to high admiration. He saw that there was one instrument, and only one, by which his vast and daring projects could be carried into execution. That instrument was a standing army. To the forming of such an army, therefore, 15 he directed all the energy of his strong mind. In Ireland, where he was viceroy, he actually succeeded in establishing a military despotism, not only over the aboriginal population, but also over the English colonists, and was able to boast that, in that island, 20 the King was as absolute as any prince in the whole world could be.²

The ecclesiastical administration was, in the meantime, principally directed by William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury. Of all the prelates of the 25 Anglican Church, Laud had departed farthest from the principles of the Reformation, and had drawn nearest to Rome. His theology was more remote than even that of the Dutch Arminians from the

¹ The correspondence of Wentworth seems to me fully to bear out what I have said in the text. To transcribe all the passages which have led me to the conclusion at which I have arrived, would be impossible ; nor would it be easy to make a better selection than has already been made by Mr. Hallam. I may, however, direct the attention of the reader particularly to the very able paper which Wentworth drew up respecting the affairs of the Palatinate. The date is March 31, 1637

² These are Wentworth's own words. See his letter to Laud, dated Dec. 16, 1634.

theology of the Calvinists. His passion for ceremonies, his reverence for holidays, vigils, and sacred places, his ill concealed dislike of the marriage of ecclesiastics, the ardent and not altogether disinterested zeal with which he asserted the claims of the clergy to the reverence of the laity, would have made him an object of aversion to the Puritans, even if he had used only legal and gentle means for the attainment of his ends. But his understanding was narrow; and his commerce with the world had been small. He was by nature rash, irritable, quick to feel for his own dignity, slow to sympathise with the sufferings of others, and prone to the error, common in superstitious men, of mistaking his own peevish and malignant moods for emotions of pious zeal. Under his direction every corner of the realm was subjected to a constant and minute inspection. Every little congregation of separatists was tracked out and broken up. Even the devotions of private families could not escape the vigilance of his spies. Such fear did his rigour inspire that the deadly hatred of the Church, which festered in innumerable bosoms, was generally disguised under an outward show of conformity. On the very eve of troubles, fatal to himself and to his order, the Bishops of several extensive dioceses were able to report to him that not a single dissenter was to be found within their jurisdiction.¹

The tribunals afforded no protection to the subject against the civil and ecclesiastical tyranny of that period. The judges of the common law, holding their situations during the pleasure of the King, were scandalously obsequious. Yet, obsequious as they were, they were less ready and less efficient instruments of arbitrary power than a class of courts, the memory of which is still, after the lapse of more than two centuries, held in deep abhorrence by the nation.

¹ See his report to Charles for the year 1639.

Foremost among these courts in power and in infamy were the Star Chamber and the High Commission, the former a political, the latter a religious inquisition. Neither was a part of the old constitution of England. The Star Chamber had been remodelled, and the High Commission created, by the Tudors. The power which these boards had possessed before the accession of Charles had been extensive and formidable, but had been small indeed when compared with that which they now usurped. Guided chiefly by the violent spirit of the primate, and freed from the control of Parliament, they displayed a rapacity, a violence, a malignant energy, which had been unknown to any former age. The government was able through their instrumentality, to fine, imprison, pillory, and mutilate without restraint. A separate council which sat at York, under the presidency of Wentworth, was armed, in defiance of law, by a pure act of prerogative, with almost boundless power over the northern counties. All these tribunals insulted and defied the authority of Westminster Hall, and daily committed excesses which the most distinguished Royalists have warmly condemned. We are informed by Clarendon that there was hardly a man of note in the realm who had not personal experience of the harshness and greediness of the Star Chamber, that the High Commission had so conducted itself that it had scarce a friend left in the kingdom, and that the tyranny of the Council of York had made the Great Charter a dead letter on the north of the Trent.

The government of England was now, in all points but one, as despotic as that of France. But that one point was all important. There was still no standing army. There was, therefore, no security that the whole fabric of tyranny might not be subverted in a single day; and, if taxes were imposed by the royal authority for the support of an army, it was probable

that there would be an immediate and irresistible explosion. This was the difficulty which more than any other perplexed Wentworth. The Lord Keeper Finch, in concert with other lawyers who were employed by the government, recommended an expedient, 5 which was eagerly adopted. The ancient princes of England, as they called on the inhabitants of the counties near Scotland to arm and array themselves for the defence of the border, had sometimes called on the maritime counties to furnish ships for the 10 defence of the coast. In the room of ships money had sometimes been accepted. This old practice it was now determined, after a long interval, not only to revive but to extend. Former princes had raised shipmoney only in time of war: it was now exacted 15 in a time of profound peace. Former princes, even in the most perilous wars, had raised shipmoney only along the coasts: it was now exacted from the inland shires. Former princes had raised shipmoney only for the maritime defence of the country: it was 20 now exacted, by the admission of the Royalists themselves, with the object, not of maintaining a navy, but of furnishing the King with supplies which might be increased at his discretion to any amount, and expended at his discretion for any purpose. 25

The whole nation was alarmed and incensed. John Hampden, an opulent and well born gentleman of Buckinghamshire, highly considered in his own neighbourhood, but as yet little known to the kingdom generally, had the courage to step forward, to 30 confront the whole power of the government, and take on himself the cost and the risk of disputing the prerogative to which the King laid claim. The case was argued before the judges in the Exchequer Chamber. So strong were the arguments against the 35 pretensions of the crown that, dependent and servile as the judges were, the majority against Hampden

was the smallest possible. Still there was a majority. The interpreters of the law had pronounced that one great and productive tax might be imposed by the royal authority. Wentworth justly observed that it was impossible to vindicate their judgment except by 5 reasons directly leading to a conclusion which they had not ventured to draw. If money might legally be raised without the consent of Parliament for the support of a fleet, it was not easy to deny that money might, without consent of Parliament, be legally raised 10 for the support of an army.

The decision of the judges increased the irritation of the people. A century earlier, irritation less serious would have produced a general rising. But discontent did not now so readily as in an earlier age 15 take the form of rebellion. The nation had been long steadily advancing in wealth and in civilisation. Since the great northern Earls took up arms against Elizabeth seventy years had elapsed; and during those seventy years there had been no civil war. 20 Never, during the whole existence of the English nation, had so long a period passed without intestine hostilities. Men had become accustomed to the pursuits of peaceful industry, and, exasperated as they were, hesitated long before they drew the sword. 25

This was the conjuncture at which the liberties of the nation were in the greatest peril. The opponents of the government began to despair of the destiny of their country; and many looked to the American wilderness as the only asylum in which they could 30 enjoy civil and spiritual freedom. There a few resolute Puritans, who, in the cause of their religion, feared neither the rage of the ocean nor the hardships of uncivilised life, neither the fangs of savage beasts nor the tomahawks of more savage men, had built, 35 amidst the primeval forests, villages which are now great and opulent cities, but which have, through

every change, retained some trace of the character derived from their founders. The government regarded these infant colonies with aversion, and attempted violently to stop the stream of emigration, but could not prevent the population of New England from being largely recruited by stouthearted and God-fearing men from every part of the old England. And now Wentworth exulted in the near prospect of Thorough. A few years might probably suffice for the execution of his great design. If strict economy were observed, if all collision with foreign powers were carefully avoided, the debts of the crown would be cleared off: there would be funds available for the support of a large military force; and that force would soon break the refractory spirit of the nation.

At this crisis an act of insane bigotry suddenly changed the whole face of public affairs. Had the King been wise, he would have pursued a cautious and soothing policy towards Scotland till he was master in the South. For Scotland was of all his kingdoms that in which there was the greatest risk that a spark might produce a flame, and that a flame might become a conflagration. Constitutional opposition, indeed, such as he had encountered at Westminster, he had not to apprehend at Edinburgh. The Parliament of his northern kingdom was a very different body from that which bore the same name in England. It was ill constituted: it was little considered; and it had never imposed any serious restraint on any of his predecessors. The three Estates sate in one house. The commissioners of the burghs were considered merely as retainers of the great nobles. No act could be introduced till it had been approved by the Lords of Articles, a committee which was really, though not in form, nominated by the crown. But, though the Scottish Parliament was obsequious, the Scottish people had always been singularly turbulent and

ungovernable. They had butchered their first James in his bedchamber : they had repeatedly arrayed themselves in arms against James the Second : they had slain James the Third on the field of battle : their disobedience had broken the heart of James the Fifth : they had deposed and imprisoned Mary : they had led her son captive ; and their temper was still as intractable as ever. Their habits were rude and martial. All along the southern border, and all along the line between the highlands and the lowlands, raged an incessant predatory war. In every part of the country men were accustomed to redress their wrongs by the strong hand. Whatever loyalty the nation had anciently felt to the Stuarts had cooled during their long absence. The supreme influence over the public mind was divided between two classes of malecontents, the lords of the soil and the preachers ; lords animated by the same spirit which had often impelled the old Douglasses to withstand the royal house, and preachers who had inherited the republican opinions and the unconquerable spirit of Knox. Both the national and religious feelings of the population had been wounded. All orders of men complained that their country, that country which had, with so much glory, defended her independence against the ablest and bravest Plantagenets, had, through the instrumentality of her native princes, become in effect, though not in name, a province of England. In no part of Europe had the Calvinistic doctrine and discipline taken so strong a hold on the public mind. The Church of Rome was regarded by the great body of the people with a hatred which might justly be called ferocious ; and the Church of England, which seemed to be every day becoming more and more like the Church of Rome, was an object of scarcely less aversion.

The government had long wished to extend the Anglican system over the whole island, and had

already, with this view, made several changes highly distasteful to every Presbyterian. One innovation, however, the most hazardous of all, because it was directly cognisable by the senses of the common people, had not yet been attempted. The public worship of God was still conducted in the manner acceptable to the nation. Now, however, Charles and Laud determined to force on the Scots the English liturgy, or rather a liturgy which, wherever it differed from that of England, differed, in the judgment of all rigid Protestants, for the worse.

To this step, taken in the mere wantonness of tyranny, and in criminal ignorance or more criminal contempt of public feeling, our country owes her freedom. The first performance of the foreign ceremonies produced a riot. The riot rapidly became a revolution. Ambition, patriotism, fanaticism, were mingled in one headlong torrent. The whole nation was in arms. The power of England was indeed, as appeared some years later, sufficient to coerce Scotland : but a large part of the English people sympathised with the religious feelings of the insurgents ; and many Englishmen who had no scruple about antiphonies and genuflexions, altars and surplices, saw with pleasure the progress of a rebellion which seemed likely to confound the arbitrary projects of the court, and to make the calling of a Parliament necessary.

For the senseless freak which had produced these effects Wentworth is not responsible.¹ It had, in fact, thrown all his plans into confusion. To counsel submission, however, was not in his nature. An attempt was made to put down the insurrection by the sword : but the King's military means and military talents were unequal to the task. To impose fresh taxes on England in defiance of law, would, at this conjuncture, have been madness. No resource was left but a

¹ See his letter to the Earl of Northumberland, dated July 30, 1638.

Parliament ; and in the spring of 1640 a Parliament was convoked.

The nation had been put into good humour by the prospect of seeing constitutional government restored, and grievances redressed. The new House of Commons was more temperate and more respectful to the throne than any which had sat since the death of Elizabeth. The moderation of this assembly has been highly extolled by the most distinguished Royalists, and seems to have caused no small vexation and dis-
appointment to the chiefs of the opposition : but it was the uniform practice of Charles, a practice equally impolitic and ungenerous, to refuse all compliance with the desires of his people, till those desires were expressed in a menacing tone. As soon as the Commons showed a disposition to take into consideration the grievances under which the country had suffered during eleven years, the King dissolved the Parliament with every mark of displeasure.

Between the dissolution of this shortlived assembly and the meeting of that ever memorable body known by the name of the Long Parliament, intervened a few months, during which the yoke was pressed down more severely than ever on the nation, while the spirit of the nation rose up more angrily than ever against the yoke. Members of the House of Commons were questioned by the Privy Council touching their parliamentary conduct, and thrown into prison for refusing to reply. Shipmoney was levied with increased rigour. The Lord Mayor and the Sheriffs of London were threatened with imprisonment for remissness in collecting the payments. Soldiers were enlisted by force. Money for their support was exacted from their counties. Torture, which had always been illegal, and which had recently been declared illegal even by the servile judges of that age, was inflicted for the last time in England in the month of May 1640.

Everything now depended on the event of the King's military operations against the Scots. Among his troops there was little of that feeling which separates professional soldiers from the mass of a nation, and attaches them to their leaders. His army, composed for the most part of recruits, who regretted the plough from which they had been violently taken, and who were imbued with the religious and political sentiments then prevalent throughout the country, was more formidable to himself than to the enemy. The Scots, encouraged by the heads of the English opposition, and feebly resisted by the English forces, marched across the Tweed and the Tyne, and encamped on the borders of Yorkshire. And now the murmurs of discontent swelled into an uproar by which all spirits save one were overawed. But the voice of Strafford was still for Thorough; and he even, in this extremity, showed a nature so cruel and despotic, that his own pikemen were ready to tear him in pieces.

There was yet one last expedient which, as the King flattered himself, might save him from the misery of facing another House of Commons. To the House of Lords he was less averse. The Bishops were devoted to him; and, though the temporal peers were generally dissatisfied with his administration, they were, as a class, so deeply interested in the maintenance of order, and in the stability of ancient institutions, that they were not likely to call for extensive reforms. Departing from the uninterrupted practice of centuries, he called a Great Council consisting of Lords alone. But the Lords were too prudent to assume the unconstitutional functions with which he wished to invest them. Without money, without credit, without authority even in his own camp, he yielded to the pressure of necessity. The Houses were convoked; and the elections proved that, since the spring, the distrust and hatred with which

the government was regarded had made fearful progress.

In November 1640 met that renowned Parliament which, in spite of many errors and disasters, is justly entitled to the reverence and gratitude of all who, in any part of the world, enjoy the blessings of constitutional government. 5

During the year which followed, no very important division of opinion appeared in the Houses. The civil and ecclesiastical administration had, through a period 10 of near twelve years, been so oppressive and so unconstitutional that even those classes of which the inclinations are generally on the side of order and authority were eager to promote popular reforms, and to bring the instruments of tyranny to justice. It was enacted 15 that no interval of more than three years should ever elapse between Parliament and Parliament, and that, if writs under the Great Seal were not issued at the proper time, the returning officers should, without such writs, call the constituent bodies together for the choice 20 of representatives. The Star Chamber, the High Commission, the Council of York were swept away. Men who, after suffering cruel mutilations, had been confined in remote dungeons, regained their liberty. On the chief ministers of the crown the vengeance 25 of the nation was unsparingly wreaked. The Lord Keeper, the Primate, the Lord Lieutenant were impeached. Finch saved himself by flight. Laud was flung into the Tower. Strafford was put to death by act of attainder. On the day on which this act passed, 30 the King gave his assent to a law by which he bound himself not to adjourn, prorogue, or dissolve the existing Parliament without its own consent.

After ten months of assiduous toil, the Houses, in September 1641, adjourned for a short vacation ; 35 and the King visited Scotland. He with difficulty pacified that kingdom by consenting, not only to

relinquish his plans of ecclesiastical reform, but even to pass, with a very bad grace, an act declaring that episcopacy was contrary to the word of God.

The recess of the English Parliament lasted six weeks. The day on which the Houses met again is one of the most remarkable epochs in our history. 5 From that day dates the corporate existence of the two great parties which have ever since alternately governed the country. In one sense, indeed, the distinction which then became obvious had always 10 existed, and always must exist. For it has its origin in diversities of temper, of understanding, and of interest, which are found in all societies, and which will be found till the human mind ceases to be drawn in opposite directions by the charm of habit and by 15 the charm of novelty. Not only in politics but in literature, in art, in science, in surgery and mechanics, in navigation and agriculture, nay, even in mathematics, we find this distinction. Everywhere there is a class of men who cling with fondness to whatever is 20 ancient, and who, even when convinced by overpowering reasons that innovation would be beneficial, consent to it with many misgivings and forebodings. We find also everywhere another class of men, sanguine in hope, bold in speculation, always pressing forward, 25 quick to discern the imperfections of whatever exists, disposed to think lightly of the risks and inconveniences which attend improvements, and disposed to give every change credit for being an improvement. In the sentiments of both classes there is something 30 to approve. But of both the best specimens will be found not far from the common frontier. The extreme section of one class consists of bigoted dotards: the extreme section of the other consists of shallow and reckless empirics. 35

There can be no doubt that in our very first Parliaments might have been discerned a body of

members anxious to preserve, and a body eager to reform. But, while the sessions of the legislature were short, these bodies did not take definite and permanent forms, array themselves under recognised leaders, or assume distinguishing names, badges, and war cries. 5 During the first months of the Long Parliament, the indignation excited by many years of lawless oppression was so strong and general that the House of Commons acted as one man. Abuse after abuse disappeared without a struggle. If a small minority of 10 the representative body wished to retain the Star Chamber and the High Commission, that minority, overawed by the enthusiasm and by the numerical superiority of the reformers, contented itself with secretly regretting institutions which could not, with 15 any hope of success, be openly defended. At a later period the Royalists found it convenient to antedate the separation between themselves and their opponents, and to attribute the Act which restrained the King from dissolving or proroguing the Parliament, the 20 Triennial Act, the impeachment of the ministers, and the attainder of Strafford, to the faction which afterwards made war on the King. But no artifice could be more disingenuous. Every one of those strong measures was actively promoted by the men who were 25 afterwards foremost among the Cavaliers. No republican spoke of the long misgovernment of Charles more severely than Colepepper. The most remarkable speech in favour of the Triennial Bill was made by Digby. The impeachment of the Lord Keeper was 30 moved by Falkland. The demand that the Lord Lieutenant should be kept close prisoner was made at the bar of the Lords by Hyde. Not till the law attainting Strafford was proposed did the signs of serious disunion become visible. Even against that law, a law 35 which nothing but extreme necessity could justify, only about sixty members of the House of Commons

voted. It is certain that Hyde was not in the minority, and that Falkland not only voted with the majority, but spoke strongly for the bill. Even the few who entertained a scruple about inflicting death by a retrospective enactment thought it necessary to express the utmost abhorrence of Strafford's character and administration.

But under this apparent concord a great schism was latent ; and when, in October 1641, the Parliament reassembled after a short recess, two hostile parties, 10 essentially the same with those which, under different names, have ever since contended, and are still contending, for the direction of public affairs, appeared confronting each other. During some years they were designated as Cavaliers and Roundheads. They were 15 subsequently called Tories and Whigs ; nor does it seem that these appellations are likely soon to become obsolete.

It would not be difficult to compose a lampoon or a panegyric on either of these renowned factions. 20 For no man not utterly destitute of judgment and candour will deny that there are many deep stains on the fame of the party to which he belongs, or that the party to which he is opposed may justly boast of many illustrious names, of many heroic actions, and of many 25 great services rendered to the state. The truth is that, though both parties have often seriously erred, England could have spared neither. If, in her institutions, freedom and order, the advantages arising from innovation and the advantages arising from prescription, 30 have been combined to an extent elsewhere unknown, we may attribute this happy peculiarity to the strenuous conflicts and alternate victories of two rival confederacies of statesmen, a confederacy zealous for authority and antiquity, and a confederacy zealous for 35 liberty and progress.

It ought to be remembered that the difference

between the two great sections of English politicians has always been a difference rather of degree than of principle. There were certain limits on the right and on the left, which were very rarely overstepped. A few enthusiasts on one side were ready to lay all our laws and franchises at the feet of our Kings. A few enthusiasts on the other side were bent on pursuing, through endless civil troubles, their darling phantom of a republic. But the great majority of those who fought for the crown were averse to despotism ; and the great majority of the champions of popular rights were averse to anarchy. Twice, in the course of the seventeenth century, the two parties suspended their dissensions, and united their strength in a common cause. Their first coalition restored hereditary monarchy. Their second coalition rescued constitutional freedom.

It is also to be noted that these two parties have never been the whole nation, nay, that they have never, taken together, made up a majority of the nation. Between them has always been a great mass, which has not steadfastly adhered to either, which has sometimes remained inertly neutral, and which has sometimes oscillated to and fro. That mass has more than once passed in a few years from one extreme to the other, and back again. Sometimes it has changed sides, merely because it was tired of supporting the same men, sometimes because it was dismayed by its own excesses, sometimes because it had expected impossibilities, and had been disappointed. But, whenever it has leaned with its whole weight in either direction, that weight has, for the time, been irresistible.

When the rival parties first appeared in a distinct form, they seemed to be not unequally matched. On the side of the government was a large majority of the nobles, and of those opulent and well descended gentlemen to whom nothing was wanting of nobility

but the name. These, with the dependents whose support they could command, were no small power in the state. On the same side were the great body of the clergy, both the Universities, and all those laymen who were strongly attached to episcopal government 5 and to the Anglican ritual. These respectable classes found themselves in the company of some allies much less decorous than themselves. The Puritan austerity drove to the King's faction all who made pleasure their business, who affected gallantry, splendour of 10 dress, or taste in the lighter arts. With these went all who live by amusing the leisure of others, from the painter and the comic poet, down to the ropedancer and the Merry Andrew. For these artists well knew that they might thrive under a superb and luxurious 15 despotism, but must starve under the rigid rule of the precisians. In the same interest were the Roman Catholics to a man. The Queen, a daughter of France, was of their own faith. Her husband was known to be strongly attached to her, and not a little in awe of 20 her. Though undoubtedly a Protestant on conviction, he regarded the professors of the old religion with no ill-will, and would gladly have granted them a much larger toleration than he was disposed to concede to the Presbyterians. If the opposition obtained the 25 mastery, it was probable that the sanguinary laws enacted against Papists, in the reign of Elizabeth, would be severely enforced. The Roman Catholics were therefore induced by the strongest motives to espouse the cause of the court. They in general acted 30 with a caution which brought on them the reproach of cowardice and lukewarmness: but it is probable that, in maintaining great reserve, they consulted the King's interest as well as their own. It was not for his service that they should be conspicuous among 35 his friends.

The main strength of the opposition lay among

the small freeholders in the country, and among the merchants and shopkeepers of the towns. But these were headed by a formidable minority of the aristocracy, a minority which included the rich and powerful Earls of Northumberland, Bedford, Warwick, Stamford, and Essex, and several other Lords of great wealth and influence. In the same ranks was found the whole body of Protestant Nonconformists, and most of those members of the Established Church who still adhered to the Calvinistic opinions which, forty years before, had been generally held by the prelates and clergy. The municipal corporations took, with few exceptions, the same side. In the House of Commons the opposition preponderated, but not very decidedly.

Neither party wanted strong arguments for the course which it was disposed to take. The reasonings of the most enlightened Royalists may be summed up thus :—"It is true that great abuses have existed ; but they have been redressed. It is true that precious rights have been invaded ; but they have been vindicated and surrounded with new securities. The sittings of the Estates of the realm have been, in defiance of all precedent and of the spirit of the constitution, intermitted during eleven years ; but it has now been provided that henceforth three years shall never elapse without a Parliament. The Star Chamber, the High Commission, the Council of York, oppressed and plundered us ; but those hateful courts have now ceased to exist. The Lord Lieutenant aimed at establishing military despotism ; but he has answered for his treason with his head. The Primate tainted our worship with Popish rites, and punished our scruples with Popish cruelty ; but he is awaiting in the Tower the judgment of his peers. The Lord Keeper sanctioned a plan by which the property of every man in England was placed at the mercy of the

Crown ; but he has been disgraced, ruined, and compelled to take refuge in a foreign land. The ministers of tyranny have expiated their crimes. The victims of tyranny have been compensated for their sufferings. It would therefore be most unwise to persevere further 5 in that course which was justifiable and necessary when we first met, after a long interval, and found the whole administration one mass of abuses. It is time to take heed that we do not so pursue our victory over despotism as to run into anarchy. It was not in our 10 power to overturn the bad institutions which lately afflicted our country, without shocks which have loosened the foundations of government. Now that those institutions have fallen, we must hasten to prop the edifice which it was lately our duty to batter. 15 Henceforth it will be our wisdom to look with jealousy on schemes of innovation, and to guard from encroachment all the prerogatives with which the law has, for the public good, armed the sovereign."

Such were the views of those men of whom the 20 excellent Falkland may be regarded as the leader. It was contended on the other side with not less force, by men of not less ability and virtue, that the safety which the liberties of the English people enjoyed was rather apparent than real, and that the arbitrary pro- 25 jects of the court would be resumed as soon as the vigilance of the Commons was relaxed. True it was, —such was the reasoning of Pym, of Hollis, and of Hampden,—that many good laws had been passed : but, if good laws had been sufficient to restrain the 30 King, his subjects would have had little reason ever to complain of his administration. The recent statutes were surely not of more authority than the Great Charter or the Petition of Right. Yet neither the Great Charter, hallowed by the veneration of four 35 centuries, nor the Petition of Right, sanctioned, after mature reflection, and for valuable consideration, by

Charles himself, had been found effectual for the protection of the people. If once the check of fear were withdrawn, if once the spirit of opposition were suffered to slumber, all the securities for English freedom resolved themselves into a single one, the royal word ; 5 and it had been proved by a long and severe experience that the royal word could not be trusted.

The two parties were still regarding each other with cautious hostility, and had not yet measured their strength, when news arrived which inflamed the 10 passions and confirmed the opinions of both. The great chieftains of Ulster, who, at the time of the accession of James, had, after a long struggle, submitted to the royal authority, had not long brooked the humiliation of dependence. They had conspired 15 against the English government, and had been attainted of treason. Their immense domains had been forfeited to the crown, and had soon been peopled by thousands of English and Scotch emigrants. The new settlers were, in civilisation and intelligence, far 20 superior to the native population, and sometimes abused their superiority. The animosity produced by difference of race was increased by difference of religion. Under the iron rule of Wentworth, scarcely a murmur was heard : but, when that strong pressure 25 was withdrawn, when Scotland had set the example of successful resistance, when England was distracted by internal quarrels, the smothered rage of the Irish broke forth into acts of fearful violence. On a sudden, the aboriginal population rose on the colonists. A 30 war, to which national and theological hatred gave a character of peculiar ferocity, desolated Ulster, and spread to the neighbouring provinces. The castle of Dublin was scarcely thought secure. Every post brought to London exaggerated accounts of outrages 35 which, without any exaggeration, were sufficient to move pity and horror. These evil tidings roused to

the height the zeal of both the great parties which were marshalled against each other at Westminster. The Royalists maintained that it was the first duty of every good Englishman and Protestant, at such a crisis, to strengthen the hands of the sovereign. To 5 the opposition it seemed that there were now stronger reasons than ever for thwarting and restraining him. That the commonwealth was in danger was undoubtedly a good reason for giving large powers to a trustworthy magistrate: but it was a good reason for 10 taking away powers from a magistrate who was at heart a public enemy. To raise a great army had always been the King's first object. A great army must now be raised. It was to be feared that, unless some new securities were devised, the forces levied for 15 the reduction of Ireland would be employed against the liberties of England. Nor was this all. A horrible suspicion, unjust indeed, but not altogether unnatural, had arisen in many minds. The Queen was an avowed Roman Catholic: the King was not regarded by the 20 Puritans, whom he had mercilessly persecuted, as a sincere Protestant; and so notorious was his duplicity, that there was no treachery of which his subjects might not, with some show of reason, believe him capable. It was soon whispered that the rebellion of 25 the Roman Catholics of Ulster was part of a vast work of darkness which had been planned at Whitehall.

After some weeks of prelude, the first great parliamentary conflict between the parties, which have ever 30 since contended, and are still contending, for the government of the nation, took place on the twenty-second of November 1641. It was moved by the opposition, that the House of Commons should present to the King a remonstrance, enumerating the faults 35 of his administration from the time of his accession, and expressing the distrust with which his policy was

still regarded by his people. That assembly, which a few months before had been unanimous in calling for the reform of abuses, was now divided into two fierce and eager factions of nearly equal strength. After a hot debate of many hours, the remonstrance was 5 carried by only eleven votes.

The result of this struggle was highly favourable to the conservative party. It could not be doubted that only some great indiscretion could prevent them from shortly obtaining the predominance in the Lower 10 House. The Upper House was already their own. Nothing was wanting to insure their success, but that the King should, in all his conduct, show respect for the laws and scrupulous good faith towards his subjects. 15

His first measures promised well. He had, it seemed, at last discovered that an entire change of system was necessary, and had wisely made up his mind to what could no longer be avoided. He declared his determination to govern in harmony with 20 the Commons, and, for that end, to call to his councils men in whose talents and character the Commons might place confidence. Nor was the selection ill made. Falkland, Hyde, and Colepepper, all three distinguished by the part which they had taken in 25 reforming abuses and in punishing evil ministers, were invited to become the confidential advisers of the Crown, and were solemnly assured by Charles that he would take no step in any way affecting the Lower House of Parliament without their privity. 30

Had he kept this promise, it cannot be doubted that the reaction which was already in progress would very soon have become quite as strong as the most respectable Royalists would have desired. Already the violent members of the opposition had begun to 35 despair of the fortunes of their party, to tremble for their own safety, and to talk of selling their estates

and emigrating to America. That the fair prospects which had begun to open before the King were suddenly overcast, that his life was darkened by adversity, and at length shortened by violence, is to be attributed to his own faithlessness and contempt of law. 5

The truth seems to be that he detested both the parties into which the House of Commons was divided: nor is this strange; for in both those parties the love of liberty and the love of order were mingled, 10 though in different proportions. The advisers whom necessity had compelled him to call round him were by no means men after his own heart. They had joined in condemning his tyranny, in abridging his power, and in punishing his instruments. They were 15 now indeed prepared to defend in a strictly legal way his strictly legal prerogative; but they would have recoiled with horror from the thought of reviving Wentworth's projects of Thorough. They were, therefore, in the King's opinion, traitors, who differed 20 only in the degree of their seditious malignity from Pym and Hampden.

He accordingly, a few days after he had promised the chiefs of the constitutional Royalists that no step of importance should be taken without their know- 25 ledge, formed a resolution the most momentous of his whole life, carefully concealed that resolution from them, and executed it in a manner which overwhelmed them with shame and dismay. He sent the Attorney General to impeach Pym, Hollis, Hampden, 30 and other members of the House of Commons of high treason at the bar of the House of Lords. Not content with this flagrant violation of the Great Charter and of the uninterrupted practice of centuries, he went in person, accompanied by armed men, to 35 seize the leaders of the opposition within the walls of Parliament.

The attempt failed. The accused members had left the House a short time before Charles entered it. A sudden and violent revulsion of feeling, both in the Parliament and in the country, followed. The most favourable view that has ever been taken of the King's conduct on this occasion by his most partial advocates is that he had weakly suffered himself to be hurried into a gross indiscretion by the evil counsels of his wife and of his courtiers. But the general voice loudly charged him with far deeper guilt. At the very moment at which his subjects, after a long estrangement produced by his maladministration, were returning to him with feelings of confidence and affection, he had aimed a deadly blow at all their dearest rights, at the privileges of Parliament, at the very principle of trial by jury. He had shown that he considered opposition to his arbitrary designs as a crime to be expiated only by blood. He had broken faith, not only with his Great Council and with his people, but with his own adherents. He had done what, but for an unforeseen accident, would probably have produced a bloody conflict round the Speaker's chair. Those who had the chief sway in the Lower House now felt that not only their power and popularity, but their lands and their necks, were staked on the event of the struggle in which they were engaged. The flagging zeal of the party opposed to the court revived in an instant. During the night which followed the outrage the whole city of London was in arms. In a few hours the roads leading to the capital were covered with multitudes of yeomen spurring hard to Westminster with the badges of the parliamentary cause in their hats. In the House of Commons the opposition became at once irresistible, and carried, by more than two votes to one, resolutions of unprecedented violence. Strong bodies of the trainbands, regularly relieved, mounted

guard round Westminster Hall. The gates of the King's palace were daily besieged by a furious multitude whose taunts and execrations were heard even in the presence chamber, and who could scarcely be kept out of the royal apartments by the gentlemen of 5 the household. Had Charles remained much longer in his stormy capital, it is probable that the Commons would have found a plea for making him, under outward forms of respect, a state prisoner.

He quitted London, never to return till the day of 10 a terrible and memorable reckoning had arrived. A negotiation began which occupied many months. Accusations and recriminations passed backward and forward between the contending parties. All accommodation had become impossible. The sure punish- 15 ment which waits on habitual perfidy had at length overtaken the King. It was to no purpose that he now pawned his royal word, and invoked heaven to witness the sincerity of his professions. The distrust with which his adversaries regarded him was not to 20 be removed by oaths or treaties. They were convinced that they could be safe only when he was utterly helpless. Their demand, therefore, was, that he should surrender, not only those prerogatives which he had usurped in violation of ancient laws 25 and of his own recent promises, but also other prerogatives which the English Kings had always possessed, and continue to possess at the present day. No minister must be appointed, no peer created, without the consent of the Houses. Above all, the 30 sovereign must resign that supreme military authority which, from time beyond all memory, had appertained to the regal office.

That Charles would comply with such demands while he had any means of resistance, was not to be 35 expected. Yet it will be difficult to show that the Houses could safely have exacted less. They were

truly in a most embarrassing position. The great majority of the nation was firmly attached to hereditary monarchy. Those who held republican opinions were as yet few, and did not venture to speak out. It was therefore impossible to abolish kingly government. Yet it was plain that no confidence could be placed in the King. It would have been absurd in those who knew, by recent proof, that he was bent on destroying them, to content themselves with presenting to him another Petition of Right, and receiving from him fresh promises similar to those which he had repeatedly made and broken. Nothing but the want of an army had prevented him from entirely subverting the old constitution of the realm. It was now necessary to levy a great regular army for the conquest of Ireland ; and it would therefore have been mere insanity to leave him in possession of that plenitude of military authority which his ancestors had enjoyed.

When a country is in the situation in which England then was, when the kingly office is regarded with love and veneration, but the person who fills that office is hated and distrusted, it should seem that the course which ought to be taken is obvious. The dignity of the office should be preserved : the person should be discarded. Thus our ancestors acted in 1399 and in 1689. Had there been, in 1642, any man occupying a position similar to that which Henry of Lancaster occupied at the time of the deposition of Richard the Second, and which William of Orange occupied at the time of the deposition of James the Second, it is probable that the Houses would have changed the dynasty, and would have made no formal change in the constitution. The new King, called to the throne by their choice, and dependent on their support, would have been under the necessity of governing in conformity with their wishes

and opinions. But there was no prince of the blood royal in the parliamentary party ; and, though that party contained many men of high rank and many men of eminent ability, there was none who towered so conspicuously above the rest that he could be proposed as a candidate for the crown. As there was to be a King, and as no new King could be found, it was necessary to leave the regal title to Charles. Only one course, therefore, was left : and that was to disjoin the regal title from the regal prerogatives.

The change which the Houses proposed to make in our institutions, though it seems exorbitant, when distinctly set forth and digested into articles of capitulation, really amounts to little more than the change which, in the next generation, was effected by the Revolution. It is true that, at the Revolution, the sovereign was not deprived by law of the power of naming his ministers : but it is equally true that, since the Revolution, no minister has been able to retain office six months in opposition to the sense of the House of Commons. It is true that the sovereign still possesses the power of creating peers, and the more important power of the sword : but it is equally true that in the exercise of these powers the sovereign has, ever since the Revolution, been guided by advisers who possess the confidence of the representatives of the nation. In fact, the leaders of the Roundhead party in 1642, and the statesmen who, about half a century later, effected the Revolution, had exactly the same object in view. That object was to terminate the contest between the Crown and the Parliament, by giving to the Parliament a supreme control over the executive administration. The statesmen of the Revolution effected this indirectly by changing the dynasty. The Roundheads of 1642, being unable to change the dynasty, were compelled to take a direct course towards their end.

We cannot, however, wonder that the demands of the opposition, importing as they did a complete and formal transfer to the Parliament of powers which had always belonged to the Crown, should have shocked that great party of which the characteristics 5 are respect for constitutional authority and dread of violent innovation. That party had recently been in hopes of obtaining by peaceable means the ascendancy in the House of Commons ; but every such hope had been blighted. The duplicity of Charles had made 10 his old enemies irreconcilable, had driven back into the ranks of the disaffected a crowd of moderate men who were in the very act of coming over to his side, and had so cruelly mortified his best friends that they had for a time stood aloof in silent shame and resentment. 15 Now, however, the constitutional Royalists were forced to make their choice between two dangers ; and they thought it their duty rather to rally round a prince whose past conduct they condemned, and whose word inspired them with little 20 confidence, than to suffer the regal office to be degraded, and the polity of the realm to be entirely remodelled. With such feelings, many men whose virtues and abilities would have done honour to any cause, ranged themselves on the side of the King. 25

In August 1642 the sword was at length drawn ; and soon, in almost every shire of the kingdom, two hostile factions appeared in arms against each other. It is not easy to say which of the contending parties was at first the more formidable. The Houses com- 30 manded London and the counties round London, the fleet, the navigation of the Thames, and most of the large towns and seaports. They had at their disposal almost all the military stores of the kingdom, and were able to raise duties, both on goods imported 35 from foreign countries, and on some important products of domestic industry. The King was ill

provided with artillery and ammunition. The taxes which he laid on the rural districts occupied by his troops produced, it is probable, a sum far less than that which the Parliament drew from the city of London alone. He relied, indeed, chiefly, for pecuniary aid, on the munificence of his opulent adherents. Many of these mortgaged their land, pawned their jewels, and broke up their silver chargers and christening bowls, in order to assist him. But experience has fully *proved that the voluntary liberality of individuals, even in times of the greatest excitement, is a poor financial resource when compared with severe and methodical taxation, which presses on the willing and unwilling alike.

Charles, however, had one advantage, which, if he had used it well, would have more than compensated for the want of stores and money, and which, notwithstanding his mismanagement, gave him, during some months, a superiority in the war. His troops at first fought much better than those of the Parliament. Both armies, it is true, were almost entirely composed of men who had never seen a field of battle. Nevertheless, the difference was great. The parliamentary ranks were filled with hirelings whom want and idleness had induced to enlist. Hampden's regiment was regarded as one of the best; and even Hampden's regiment was described by Cromwell as a mere rabble of tapsters and serving men out of place. The royal army, on the other hand, consisted in great part of gentlemen, high spirited, ardent, accustomed to consider dishonour as more terrible than death, accustomed to fencing, to the use of fire arms, to bold riding, and to manly and perilous sport, which has been well called the image of war. Such gentlemen, mounted on their favourite horses, and commanding little bands, composed of their younger brothers, grooms, gamekeepers, and huntsmen, were, from the

very first day on which they took the field, qualified to play their part with credit in a skirmish. The steadiness, the prompt obedience, the mechanical precision of movement, which are characteristic of the regular soldier, these gallant volunteers never attained. 5 But they were at first opposed to enemies as undisciplined as themselves, and far less active, athletic, and daring. For a time, therefore, the Cavaliers were successful in almost every encounter.

The Houses had also been unfortunate in the 10 choice of a general. The rank and wealth of the Earl of Essex made him one of the most important members of the parliamentary party. He had borne arms on the Continent with credit, and, when the war began, had as high a military reputation as any man in the 15 country. But it soon appeared that he was unfit for the post of Commander in Chief. He had little energy and no originality. The methodical tactics which he had learned in the war of the Palatinate did not save him from the disgrace of being surprised and 20 baffled by such a Captain as Rupert, who could claim no higher fame than that of an enterprising partisan.

Nor were the officers who held the chief commissions under Essex qualified to supply what was wanting in him. For this, indeed, the Houses are scarcely 25 to be blamed. In a country which had not, within the memory of the oldest person living, made war on a great scale by land, generals of tried skill and valour were not to be found. It was necessary, therefore, in the first instance, to trust untried men; and the 30 preference was naturally given to men distinguished either by their station, or by the abilities which they had displayed in Parliament. In scarcely a single instance, however, was the selection fortunate. Neither the grandees nor the orators proved good 35 soldiers. The Earl of Stamford, one of the greatest nobles of England, was routed by the Royalists at

Stratton. Nathaniel Fiennes, inferior to none of his contemporaries in talents for civil business, disgraced himself by the pusillanimous surrender of Bristol. Indeed, of all the statesmen who at this juncture accepted high military commands, Hampden alone appears to have carried into the camp the capacity and strength of mind which had made him eminent in politics. 5

When the war had lasted a year, the advantage was decidedly with the Royalists. They were 10 victorious, both in the western and in the northern counties. They had wrested Bristol, the second city in the kingdom, from the Parliament. They had won several battles, and had not sustained a single serious or ignominious defeat. Among the Roundheads 15 adversity had begun to produce dissension and discontent. The Parliament was kept in alarm, sometimes by plots, and sometimes by riots. It was thought necessary to fortify London against the royal army, and to hang some disaffected citizens at 20 their own doors. Several of the most distinguished peers who had hitherto remained at Westminster fled to the court at Oxford; nor can it be doubted that, if the operations of the Cavaliers had, at this season, been directed by a sagacious and powerful mind, 25 Charles would soon have marched in triumph to Whitehall.

But the King suffered the auspicious moment to pass away; and it never returned. In August 1643 he sat down before the city of Gloucester. That city 30 was defended by the inhabitants and by the garrison, with a determination such as had not, since the commencement of the war, been shown by the adherents of the Parliament. The emulation of London was excited. The trainbands of the City volunteered 35 to march wherever their services might be required. A great force was speedily collected, and began to

move westward. The siege of Gloucester was raised : the Royalists in every part of the kingdom were disheartened : the spirit of the parliamentary party revived : and the apostate Lords, who had lately fled from Westminster to Oxford, hastened back from 5 Oxford to Westminster.

And now a new and alarming class of symptoms began to appear in the distempered body politic. There had been, from the first, in the parliamentary party, some men whose minds were set on objects 10 from which the majority of that party would have shrunk with horror. These men were, in religion, Independents. They conceived that every Christian congregation had, under Christ, supreme jurisdiction in things spiritual ; that appeals to provincial and 15 national synods were scarcely less unscriptural than appeals to the Court of Arches, or to the Vatican ; and that Popery, Prelacy, and Presbyterianism were merely three forms of one great apostasy. In politics, the Independents were, to use the phrase of their 20 time, root and branch men, or, to use the kindred phrase of our own time, radicals. Not content with limiting the power of the monarch, they were desirous to erect a commonwealth on the ruins of the old English polity. At first they had been inconsiderable, 25 both in numbers and in weight ; but before the war had lasted two years they became, not indeed the largest, but the most powerful faction in the country. Some of the old parliamentary leaders had been removed by death ; and others had forfeited the pub- 30 lic confidence. Pym had been borne, with princely honours, to a grave among the Plantagenets. Hampden had fallen, as became him, while vainly endeavouring, by his heroic example, to inspire his followers with courage to face the fiery cavalry of Rupert. Bedford 35 had been untrue to the cause. Northumberland was known to be lukewarm. Essex and his lieutenants

had shown little vigour and ability in the conduct of military operations. At such a conjuncture it was that the Independent party, ardent, resolute, and uncompromising, began to raise its head, both in the camp and in the House of Commons.

The soul of that party was Oliver Cromwell. Bred⁵ to peaceful occupations, he had, at more than forty years of age, accepted a commission in the parliamentary army. No sooner had he become a soldier than he discerned, with the keen glance of genius, what¹⁰ Essex, and men like Essex, with all their experience, were unable to perceive. He saw precisely where the strength of the Royalists lay, and by what means alone that strength could be overpowered. He saw that it was necessary to reconstruct the army of the¹⁵ Parliament. He saw also that there were abundant and excellent materials for the purpose, materials less showy, indeed, but more solid, than those of which the gallant squadrons of the King were composed. It was necessary to look for recruits who were not mere²⁰ mercenaries, for recruits of decent station and grave character, fearing God and zealous for public liberty. With such men he filled his own regiment, and, while he subjected them to a discipline more rigid than had ever before been known in England, he administered²⁵ to their intellectual and moral nature stimulants of fearful potency.

The events of the year 1644 fully proved the superiority of his abilities. In the south, where Essex held the command, the parliamentary forces underwent a³⁰ succession of shameful disasters; but in the north the victory of Marston Moor fully compensated for all that had been lost elsewhere. That victory was not a more serious blow to the Royalists than to the party which had hitherto been dominant at Westminster; for it³⁵ was notorious that the day, disgracefully lost by the Presbyterians, had been retrieved by the energy of

Cromwell, and by the steady valour of the warriors whom he had trained.

These events produced the Selfdenying Ordinance and the new model of the army. Under decorous pretexts, and with every mark of respect, Essex and 5 most of those who had held high posts under him were removed ; and the conduct of the war was intrusted to very different hands. Fairfax, a brave soldier, but of mean understanding and irresolute temper, was the nominal Lord General of the forces ; but Cromwell 10 was their real head.

Cromwell made haste to organise the whole army on the same principles on which he had organised his own regiment. As soon as this process was complete, the event of the war was decided. The Cavaliers had 15 now to encounter natural courage equal to their own, enthusiasm stronger than their own, and discipline such as was utterly wanting to them. It soon became a proverb that the soldiers of Fairfax and Cromwell were men of a different breed from the soldiers of 20 Essex. At Naseby took place the first great encounter between the Royalists and the remodelled army of the Houses. The victory of the Roundheads was complete and decisive. It was followed by other triumphs in rapid succession. In a few months the 25 authority of the Parliament was fully established over the whole kingdom. Charles fled to the Scots, and was by them, in a manner which did not much exalt their national character, delivered up to his English subjects.

While the event of the war was still doubtful, the 30 Houses had put the Primate to death, had interdicted, within the sphere of their authority, the use of the Liturgy, and had required all men to subscribe that renowned instrument known by the name of the 35 Solemn League and Covenant. Covenanting work, as it was called, went on fast. Hundreds of thousands

affixed their names to the rolls, and, with hands lifted up towards heaven, swore to endeavour, without respect of persons, the extirpation of Popery and Prelacy, heresy and schism, and to bring to public trial and condign punishment all who should hinder the reformation of religion. When the struggle was over, the work of innovation and revenge was pushed on with increased ardour. The ecclesiastical polity of the kingdom was remodelled. Most of the old clergy were ejected from their benefices. Fines, often of ruinous amount, were laid on the Royalists, already impoverished by large aids furnished to the King. Many estates were confiscated. Many proscribed Cavaliers found it expedient to purchase, at an enormous cost, the protection of eminent members of the victorious party. Large domains, belonging to the crown, to the bishops, and to the chapters, were seized, and either granted away or put up to auction. In consequence of these spoliations, a great part of the soil of England was at once offered for sale. As money was scarce, as the market was glutted, as the title was insecure, and as the awe inspired by powerful bidders prevented free competition, the prices were often merely nominal. Thus many old and honourable families disappeared and were heard of no more; and many new men rose rapidly to affluence.

But, while the Houses were employing their authority thus, it suddenly passed out of their hands. It had been obtained by calling into existence a power which could not be controlled. In the summer of 1647, about twelve months after the last fortress of the Cavaliers had submitted to the Parliament, the Parliament was compelled to submit to its own soldiers.

Thirteen years followed, during which England was, under various names and forms, really governed by the sword. Never before that time, or since that

time, was the civil power in our country subjected to military dictation.

The army which now became supreme in the state was an army very different from any that has since been seen among us. At present the pay of the common soldier is not such as can seduce any but the humblest class of English labourers from their calling. A barrier almost impassable separates him from the commissioned officer. The great majority of those who rise high in the service rise by purchase. So numerous and extensive are the remote dependencies of England, that every man who enlists in the line must expect to pass many years in exile, and some years in climates unfavourable to the health and vigour of the European race. The army of the Long Parliament was raised for home service. The pay of the private soldier was much above the wages earned by the great body of the people ; and, if he distinguished himself by intelligence and courage, he might hope to attain high commands. The ranks were accordingly composed of persons superior in station and education to the multitude. These persons, sober, moral, diligent, and accustomed to reflect, had been induced to take up arms, not by the pressure of want, not by the love of novelty and license, not by the arts of recruiting officers, but by religious and political zeal, mingled with the desire of distinction and promotion. The boast of the soldiers, as we find it recorded in their solemn resolutions, was that they had not been forced into the service, nor had enlisted chiefly for the sake of lucre, that they were no janissaries, but freeborn Englishmen, who had, of their own accord, put their lives in jeopardy for the liberties and religion of England, and whose right and duty it was to watch over the welfare of the nation which they had saved.

A force thus composed might, without injury to its efficiency, be indulged in some liberties which, if

allowed to any other troops, would have proved subversive of all discipline. In general, soldiers who should form themselves into political clubs, elect delegates, and pass resolutions on high questions of state, would soon break loose from all control, would 5 cease to form an army, and would become the worst and most dangerous of mobs. Nor would it be safe, in our time, to tolerate in any regiment religious meetings, at which a corporal versed in Scripture should lead the devotions of his less gifted colonel, 10 and admonish a backsliding major. But such was the intelligence, the gravity, and the selfcommand of the warriors whom Cromwell had trained, that in their camp a political organisation and a religious organisation could exist without destroying military organisation. 15 The same men, who, off duty, were noted as demagogues and field preachers, were distinguished by steadiness, by the spirit of order, and by prompt obedience on watch, on drill, and on the field of battle.

In war this strange force was irresistible. The 20 stubborn courage characteristic of the English people was, by the system of Cromwell, at once regulated and stimulated. Other leaders have maintained order as strict. Other leaders have inspired their followers with zeal as ardent. But in his camp alone the most 25 rigid discipline was found in company with the fiercest enthusiasm. His troops moved to victory with the precision of machines, while burning with the wildest fanaticism of Crusaders. From the time when the army was remodelled to the time when it 30 was disbanded, it never found, either in the British islands or on the Continent, an enemy who could stand its onset. In England, Scotland, Ireland, Flanders, the Puritan warriors, often surrounded by difficulties, sometimes contending against threefold 35 odds, not only never failed to conquer, but never failed to destroy and break in pieces whatever force

was opposed to them. They at length came to regard the day of battle as a day of certain triumph, and marched against the most renowned battalions of Europe with disdainful confidence. Turenne was startled by the shout of stern exultation with which his English allies advanced to the combat, and expressed the delight of a true soldier, when he learned that it was ever the fashion of Cromwell's pikemen to rejoice greatly when they beheld the enemy; and the banished Cavaliers felt an emotion of national pride, when they saw a brigade of their countrymen, outnumbered by foes and abandoned by friends, drive before it in headlong rout the finest infantry of Spain, and force a passage into a counterscarp which had just been pronounced impregnable by the ablest of the Marshals of France.

But that which chiefly distinguished the army of Cromwell from other armies was the austere morality and the fear of God which pervaded all ranks. It is acknowledged by the most zealous Royalists that, in that singular camp, no oath was heard, no drunkenness or gambling was seen, and that, during the long dominion of the soldiery, the property of the peaceable citizen and the honour of woman were held sacred. If outrages were committed, they were outrages of a very different kind from those of which a victorious army is generally guilty. No servant girl complained of the rough gallantry of the redcoats. Not an ounce of plate was taken from the shops of the goldsmiths. But a Pelagian sermon, or a window on which the Virgin and Child were painted, produced in the Puritan ranks an excitement which it required the utmost exertions of the officers to quell. One of Cromwell's chief difficulties was to restrain his musketeers and dragoons from invading by main force the pulpits of ministers whose discourses, to use the language of that time, were not savoury; and too

many of our cathedrals still bear the marks of the hatred with which those stern spirits regarded every vestige of Popery.

To keep down the English people was no light task even for that army. No sooner was the first 5 pressure of military tyranny felt, than the nation, unbroken to such servitude, began to struggle fiercely. Insurrections broke out even in those counties which, during the recent war, had been the most submissive to the Parliament. Indeed, the Parliament itself 10 abhorred its old defenders more than its old enemies, and was desirous to come to terms of accommodation with Charles at the expense of the troops. In Scotland at the same time, a coalition was formed between the Royalists and a large body of Presbyterians who 15 regarded the doctrines of the Independents with detestation. At length the storm burst. There were risings in Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Kent, Wales. The fleet in the Thames suddenly hoisted the royal colours, stood out to sea, and menaced the southern 20 coast. A great Scottish force crossed the frontier and advanced into Lancashire. It might well be suspected that these movements were contemplated with secret complacency by a majority both of the Lords and of the Commons.

25 But the yoke of the army was not to be so shaken off. While Fairfax suppressed the risings in the neighbourhood of the capital, Oliver routed the Welsh insurgents, and, leaving their castles in ruins, marched against the Scots. His troops were few, when com- 30 pared with the invaders; but he was little in the habit of counting his enemies. The Scottish army was utterly destroyed. A change in the Scottish government followed. An administration, hostile to the King, was formed at Edinburgh; and Cromwell, 35 more than ever the darling of his soldiers, returned in triumph to London.

And now a design, to which, at the commencement of the civil war, no man would have dared to allude, and which was not less inconsistent with the Solemn League and Covenant than with the old law of England, began to take a distinct form. The austere warriors who ruled the nation had, during some months, meditated a fearful vengeance on the captive King. When and how the scheme originated ; whether it spread from the general to the ranks, or from the ranks to the general ; whether it is to be ascribed to policy using fanaticism as a tool, or to fanaticism bearing down policy with headlong impulse, are questions which, even at this day, cannot be answered with perfect confidence. It seems, however, on the whole, probable that he who seemed to lead was really forced to follow, and that, on this occasion, as on another great occasion a few years later, he sacrificed his own judgment and his own inclinations to the wishes of the army. For the power which he had called into existence was a power which even he could not always control ; and, that he might ordinarily command, it was necessary that he should sometimes obey. He publicly protested that he was no mover in the matter, that the first steps had been taken without his privity, that he could not advise the Parliament to strike the blow, but that he submitted his own feelings to the force of circumstances which seemed to him to indicate the purposes of Providence. It has been the fashion to consider these professions as instances of the hypocrisy which is vulgarly imputed to him. But even those who pronounce him a hypocrite will scarcely venture to call him a fool. They are therefore bound to show that he had some purpose to serve by secretly stimulating the army to take that course which he did not venture openly to recommend. It would be absurd to suppose that he, who was never by his

respectable enemies represented as wantonly cruel or implacably vindictive, would have taken the most important step of his life under the influence of mere malevolence. He was far too wise a man not to know, when he consented to shed that august blood, 5 that he was doing a deed which was inexpiable, and which would move the grief and horror, not only of the Royalists, but of nine tenths of those who had stood by the Parliament. Whatever visions may have deluded others, he was assuredly dreaming 10 neither of a republic on the antique pattern, nor of the millennial reign of the Saints. If he already aspired to be himself the founder of a new dynasty, it was plain that Charles the First was a less formidable competitor than Charles the Second would be. 15 At the moment of the death of Charles the First the loyalty of every Cavalier would be transferred, unimpaired, to Charles the Second. Charles the First was a captive. Charles the Second would be at liberty. Charles the First was an object of suspicion and dis- 20 like to a large proportion of those who yet shuddered at the thought of slaying him: Charles the Second would excite all the interest which belongs to distressed youth and innocence. It is impossible to believe that considerations so obvious, and so impor- 25 tant, escaped the most profound politician of that age. The truth is that Cromwell had, at one time, meant to mediate between the throne and the Parliament, and to reorganise the distracted State by the power of the sword, under the sanction of the royal 30 name. In this design he persisted till he was compelled to abandon it by the refractory temper of the soldiers, and by the incurable duplicity of the King. A party in the camp began to clamour for the head of the traitor, who was for treating with Agag. Con- 35 spiracies were formed. Threats of impeachment were loudly uttered. A mutiny broke out, which all the

vigour and resolution of Oliver could hardly quell. And though, by a judicious mixture of severity and kindness, he succeeded in restoring order, he saw that it would be in the highest degree difficult and perilous to contend against the rage of warriors, who regarded 5 the fallen tyrant as their foe, and as the foe of their God. At the same time it became more evident than ever that the King could not be trusted. The vices of Charles had grown upon him. They were, indeed, vices which difficulties and perplexities generally 10 bring out in the strongest light. Cunning is the natural defence of the weak. A prince therefore, who is habitually a deceiver when at the height of power, is not likely to learn frankness in the midst of embarrassments and distresses. Charles was not only 15 a most unscrupulous but a most unlucky dissembler. There never was a politician to whom so many frauds and falsehoods were brought home by undeniable evidence. He publicly recognised the Houses at Westminster as a legal Parliament, and, at the same 20 time, made a private minute in council declaring the recognition null. He publicly disclaimed all thought of calling in foreign aid against his people: he privately solicited aid from France, from Denmark, and from Lorraine. He publicly denied that he employed 25 Papists at the same time he privately sent to his generals directions to employ every Papist that would serve. He publicly took the sacrament at Oxford, as a pledge that he never would even connive at Popery. He privately assured his wife, that he intended to 30 tolerate Popery in England; and he authorised Lord Glamorgan to promise that Popery should be established in Ireland. Then he attempted to clear himself at his agent's expense. Glamorgan received, in the Royal handwriting, reprimands intended to be 35 read by others, and eulogies which were to be seen only by himself. To such an extent, indeed, had

insincerity now tainted the King's whole nature, that his most devoted friends could not refrain from complaining to each other, with bitter grief and shame, of his crooked politics. His defeats, they said, gave them less pain than his intrigues. Since he had 5 been a prisoner, there was no section of the victorious party which had not been the object both of his flatteries and of his machinations : but never was he more unfortunate than when he attempted at once to cajole and to undermine Cromwell. 10

Cromwell had to determine whether he would put to hazard the attachment of his party, the attachment of his army, his own greatness, nay his own life, in an attempt which would probably have been vain, to save a prince whom no engagement could bind. 15 With many struggles and misgivings, and probably not without many prayers, the decision was made. Charles was left to his fate. The military saints resolved that, in defiance of the old laws of the realm, and of the almost universal sentiment of the nation, 20 the King should expiate his crimes with his blood. He for a time expected a death like that of his unhappy predecessors, Edward the Second and Richard the Second. But he was in no danger of such treason. Those who had him in their gripe were not 25 midnight stabbers. What they did they did in order that it might be a spectacle to heaven and earth, and that it might be held in everlasting remembrance. They enjoyed keenly the very scandal which they gave. That the ancient constitution and the public 30 opinion of England were directly opposed to regicide made regicide seem strangely fascinating to a party bent on effecting a complete political and social revolution. In order to accomplish their purpose, it was necessary that they should first break in pieces 35 every part of the machinery of the government ; and this necessity was rather agreeable than painful to

them. The Commons passed a vote tending to accommodation with the King. The soldiers excluded the majority by force. The Lords unanimously rejected the proposition that the King should be brought to trial. Their house was instantly closed. 5 No court, known to the law, would take on itself the office of judging the fountain of justice. A revolutionary tribunal was created. That tribunal pronounced Charles a tyrant, a traitor, a murderer, and a public enemy; and his head was severed from his 10 shoulders, before thousands of spectators, in front of the banqueting hall of his own palace.

In no long time it became manifest that those political and religious zealots, to whom this deed is to be ascribed, had committed, not only a crime, but an 15 error. They had given to a prince, hitherto known to his people chiefly by his faults, an opportunity of displaying, on a great theatre, before the eyes of all nations and all ages, some qualities which irresistibly call forth the admiration and love of mankind, the 20 high spirit of a gallant gentleman, the patience and meekness of a penitent Christian. Nay, they had so contrived their revenge that the very man whose life had been a series of attacks on the liberties of England now seemed to die a martyr in the cause of 25 those liberties. No demagogue ever produced such an impression on the public mind as the captive King, who, retaining in that extremity all his regal dignity, and confronting death with dauntless courage, gave utterance to the feelings of his oppressed people, man- 30 fully refused to plead before a court unknown to the law, appealed from military violence to the principles of the constitution, asked by what right the House of Commons had been purged of its most respectable members and the House of Lords deprived of its 35 legislative functions, and told his weeping hearers that he was defending, not only his own cause, but

theirs. His long misgovernment, his innumerable perfidies, were forgotten. His memory was, in the minds of the great majority of his subjects, associated with those free institutions which he had, during many years, laboured to destroy : for those free institutions 5 had perished with him, and, amidst the mournful silence of a community kept down by arms, had been defended by his voice alone. From that day began a reaction in favour of monarchy and of the exiled house, a reaction which never ceased till the throne 10 had again been set up in all its old dignity.

At first, however, the slayers of the King seemed to have derived new energy from that sacrament of blood by which they had bound themselves closely together, and separated themselves for ever from 15 the great body of their countrymen. England was declared a commonwealth. The House of Commons, reduced to a small number of members, was nominally the supreme power in the state. In fact, the army and its great chief governed everything. Oliver had 20 made his choice. He had kept the hearts of his soldiers, and had broken with almost every other class of his fellow citizens. Beyond the limits of his camps and fortresses he could scarcely be said to have a party. Those elements of force which, when 25 the civil war broke out, had appeared arrayed against each other, were combined against him ; all the Cavaliers, the great majority of the Roundheads, the Anglican Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Roman Catholic Church, England, Scotland, Ireland. Yet 30 such was his genius and resolution that he was able to overpower and crush everything that crossed his path, to make himself more absolute master of his country than any of her legitimate Kings had been, and to make his country more dreaded and respected 35 than she had been during many generations under the rule of her legitimate Kings.

England had already ceased to struggle. But the two other kingdoms which had been governed by the Stuarts were hostile to the new republic. The Independent party was equally odious to the Roman Catholics of Ireland and to the Presbyterians of Scotland. Both those countries, lately in rebellion against Charles the First, now acknowledged the authority of Charles the Second.

But everything yielded to the vigour and ability of Cromwell. In a few months he subjugated Ireland, as Ireland had never been subjugated during the five centuries of slaughter which had elapsed since the landing of the first Norman settlers. He resolved to put an end to that conflict of races and religions which had so long distracted the island, by making the English and Protestant population decidedly predominant. For this end he gave the rein to the fierce enthusiasm of his followers, waged war resembling that which Israel waged on the Canaanites, smote the idolaters with the edge of the sword, so that great cities were left without inhabitants, drove many thousands to the Continent, shipped off many thousands to the West Indies, and supplied the void thus made by pouring in numerous colonists, of Saxon blood, and of Calvinistic faith. Strange to say, under that iron rule, the conquered country began to wear an outward face of prosperity. Districts, which had recently been as wild as those where the first white settlers of Connecticut were contending with the red men, were in a few years transformed into the likeness of Kent and Norfolk. New buildings, roads, and plantations were everywhere seen. The rent of estates rose fast; and soon the English landowners began to complain that they were met in every market by the products of Ireland, and to clamour for protecting laws.

From Ireland the victorious chief, who was now in

name, as he had long been in reality, Lord General of the armies of the Commonwealth, turned to Scotland. The young King was there. He had consented to profess himself a Presbyterian, and to subscribe the Covenant; and, in return for these concessions, the austere Puritans who bore sway at Edinburgh had permitted him to assume the crown, and to hold, under their inspection and control, a solemn and melancholy court. This mock royalty was of short duration. In two great battles Cromwell annihilated the military force of Scotland. Charles fled for his life, and, with extreme difficulty, escaped the fate of his father. The ancient kingdom of the Stuarts was reduced, for the first time, to profound submission. Of that independence, so manfully defended against the mightiest and ablest of the Plantagenets, no vestige was left. The English Parliament made laws for Scotland. English judges held assizes in Scotland. Even that stubborn Church, which has held its own against so many governments, scarce dared to utter an audible murmur.

Thus far there had been at least the semblance of harmony between the warriors who had subjugated Ireland and Scotland and the politicians who sate at Westminster: but the alliance which had been cemented by danger was dissolved by victory. The Parliament forgot that it was but the creature of the army. The army was less disposed than ever to submit to the dictation of the Parliament. Indeed, the few members who made up what was contemptuously called the Rump of the House of Commons had no more claim than the military chiefs to be esteemed the representatives of the nation. The dispute was soon brought to a decisive issue. Cromwell filled the House with armed men. The Speaker was pulled out of his chair, the mace taken from the table, the room cleared, and the door locked. The nation,

which loved neither of the contending parties, but which was forced, in its own despite, to respect the capacity and resolution of the General, looked on with patience, if not with complacency.

King, Lords, and Commons, had now in turn been 5
vanquished and destroyed ; and Cromwell seemed to be left the sole heir of the powers of all three. Yet were certain limitations still imposed on him by the very army to which he owed his immense authority. That singular body of men was, for the most part, 10
composed of zealous republicans. In the act of enslaving their country, they had deceived themselves into the belief that they were emancipating her. The book which they most venerated furnished them with a precedent which was frequently in their mouths. 15
It was true that the ignorant and ungrateful nation murmured against its deliverers. Even so had another chosen nation murmured against the leader who brought it, by painful and dreary paths, from the house of bondage to the land flowing with milk and 20
honey. Yet had that leader rescued his brethren in spite of themselves ; nor had he shrunk from making terrible examples of those who contemned the proffered freedom, and pined for the fleshpots, the taskmasters, and the idolatries of Egypt. The object 25
of the warlike saints who surrounded Cromwell was the settlement of a free and pious commonwealth. For that end they were ready to employ, without scruple, any means, however violent and lawless. It was not impossible, therefore, to establish by their 30
aid a dictatorship such as no King had ever exercised : but it was probable that their aid would be at once withdrawn from a ruler who, even under strict constitutional restraints, should venture to assume the kingly name and dignity. 35

The sentiments of Cromwell were widely different. He was not what he had been ; nor would it be just

to consider the change which his views had undergone as the effect merely of selfish ambition. He had, when he came up to the Long Parliament, brought with him, from his rural retreat little knowledge of books, no experience of great affairs, and a temper galled by the long tyranny of the government and of the hierarchy. He had, during the thirteen years which followed, gone through a political education of no common kind. He had been a chief actor in a succession of revolutions. He had been long the soul, and at last the head, of a party. He had commanded armies, won battles, negotiated treaties, subdued, pacified, and regulated kingdoms. It would have been strange indeed if his notions had been still the same as in the days when his mind was principally occupied by his fields and his religion, and when the greatest events which diversified the course of his life were a cattle fair or a prayer meeting at Huntingdon. He saw that some schemes of innovation for which he had once been zealous, whether good or bad in themselves, were opposed to the general feeling of the country, and that, if he persevered in those schemes, he had nothing before him but constant troubles, which must be suppressed by the constant use of the sword. He therefore wished to restore, in all essentials, that ancient constitution which the majority of the people had always loved, and for which they now pined. The course afterwards taken by Monk was not open to Cromwell. The memory of one terrible day separated the great regicide for ever from the House of Stuart. What remained was that he should mount the ancient English throne, and reign according to the ancient English polity. If he could effect this, he might hope that the wounds of the lacerated State would heal fast. Great numbers of honest and quiet men would speedily rally round him. Those Royalists whose attachment was rather to institutions than to

persons, to the kingly office than to King Charles the First or King Charles the Second, would soon kiss the hand of King Oliver. The peers, who now remained sullenly at their country houses, and refused to take any part in public affairs, would, when 5 summoned to their House by the writ of a King in possession, gladly resume their ancient functions. Northumberland and Bedford, Manchester and Pembroke, would be proud to bear the crown and the spurs, the sceptre and the globe, before the restorer 10 of aristocracy. A sentiment of loyalty would gradually bind the people to the new dynasty ; and, on the decease of the founder of that dynasty, the royal dignity might descend with general acquiescence to his posterity.

15

The ablest Royalists were of opinion that these views were correct, and that, if Cromwell had been permitted to follow his own judgment, the exiled line would never have been restored. But his plan was directly opposed to the feelings of the only class 20 which he dared not offend. The name of King was hateful to the soldiers. Some of them were indeed unwilling to see the administration in the hands of any single person. The great majority, however, were disposed to support their general, as elective 25 first magistrate of a commonwealth, against all factions which might resist his authority : but they would not consent that he should assume the regal title, or that the dignity, which was the just reward of his personal merit, should be declared hereditary 30 in his family. All that was left to him was to give to the new republic a constitution as like the constitution of the old monarchy as the army would bear. That his elevation to power might not seem to be merely his own act, he convoked a council, composed partly of 35 persons on whose support he could depend, and partly of persons whose opposition he might safely defy.

This assembly, which he called a Parliament, and which the populace nicknamed, from one of the most conspicuous members, Barebone's Parliament, after exposing itself during a short time to the public contempt, surrendered back to the General the powers 5 which it had received from him, and left him at liberty to frame a plan of government.

His plan bore, from the first, a considerable resemblance to the old English constitution : but, in a few years, he thought it safe to proceed further, and 10 to restore almost every part of the ancient system under new names and forms. The title of King was not revived : but the kingly prerogatives were intrusted to a Lord High Protector. The sovereign was called not His Majesty, but His Highness. He 15 was not crowned and anointed in Westminster Abbey, but was solemnly enthroned, girt with a sword of state, clad in a robe of purple, and presented with a rich Bible, in Westminster Hall. His office was not declared hereditary : but he was permitted 20 to name his successor ; and none could doubt that he would name his son.

A House of Commons was a necessary part of the new polity. In constituting this body, the Protector showed a wisdom and a public spirit which 25 were not duly appreciated by his contemporaries. The vices of the old representative system, though by no means so serious as they afterwards became, had already been remarked by farsighted men. Cromwell reformed that system on the same principles on 30 which Mr. Pitt, a hundred and thirty years later, attempted to reform it, and on which it was at length reformed in our own times. Small boroughs were disfranchised even more unsparingly than in 1832 ; and the number of county members was greatly in- 35 creased. Very few unrepresented towns had yet grown into importance. Of those towns the most

considerable were Manchester, Leeds, and Halifax. Representatives were given to all three. An addition was made to the number of the members for the capital. The elective franchise was placed on such a footing that every man of substance, whether possessed of freehold estates in land or not, had a vote for the county in which he resided. A few Scotchmen and a few of the English Colonists settled in Ireland were summoned to the assembly which was to legislate, at Westminster, for every part of the British isles. 10

To create a House of Lords was a less easy task. Democracy does not require the support of prescription. Monarchy has often stood without that support. But a patrician order is the work of time. 15 Oliver found already existing a nobility, opulent, highly considered, and as popular with the commonalty as any nobility has ever been. Had he, as King of England, commanded the peers to meet him in Parliament according to the old usage of the realm, 20 many of them would undoubtedly have obeyed the call. This he could not do ; and it was to no purpose that he offered to the chiefs of illustrious families seats in his new senate. They conceived that they could not accept a nomination to an upstart assembly without 25 renouncing their birthright and betraying their order. The Protector was, therefore, under the necessity of filling his Upper House with new men who, during the late stirring times, had made themselves conspicuous. This was the least happy of his contrivances, and displeased all parties. The Levellers were angry with him for instituting a privileged class. 30 The multitude, which felt respect and fondness for the great historical names of the land, laughed without restraint at a House of Lords, in which lucky draymen and shoemakers were seated, to which few of the old nobles were invited, and from which

almost all those old nobles who were invited turned disdainfully away.

How Oliver's Parliaments were constituted, however, was practically of little moment: for he possessed the means of conducting the administration 5 without their support, and in defiance of their opposition. His wish seems to have been to govern constitutionally, and to substitute the empire of the laws for that of the sword. But he soon found that, hated as he was, both by Royalists and Presbyterians, he 10 could be safe only by being absolute. The first House of Commons which the people elected by his command, questioned his authority, and was dissolved without having passed a single act. His second House of Commons, though it recognised him 15 as Protector, and would gladly have made him King, obstinately refused to acknowledge his new Lords. He had no course left but to dissolve the Parliament. 'God,' he exclaimed, at parting, 'be judge between you and me!' 20

Yet was the energy of the Protector's administration in nowise relaxed by these dissensions. Those soldiers who would not suffer him to assume the kingly title stood by him when he ventured on acts of power, as high as any English King has ever 25 attempted. The government, therefore, though in form a republic, was in truth a despotism, moderated only by the wisdom, the sobriety, and the magnanimity of the despot. The country was divided into military districts. Those districts were placed 30 under the command of Major Generals. Every insurrectionary movement was promptly put down and punished. The fear inspired by the power of the sword, in so strong, steady, and expert a hand, quelled the spirit both of Cavaliers and Levellers. 35 The loyal gentry declared that they were still as ready as ever to risk their lives for the old govern-

ment and the old dynasty, if there were the slightest hope of success : but to rush, at the head of their serving men and tenants, on the pikes of brigades victorious in a hundred battles and sieges, would be a frantic waste of innocent and honourable blood. 5 Both Royalists and Republicans, having no hope in open resistance, began to revolve dark schemes of assassination : but the Protector's intelligence was good : his vigilance was unremitting ; and, whenever he moved beyond the walls of his palace, the drawn 10 swords and cuirasses of his trusty bodyguards encompassed him thick on every side.

Had he been a cruel, licentious, and rapacious prince, the nation might have found courage in despair, and might have made a convulsive effort 15 to free itself from military domination. But the grievances which the country suffered, though such as excited serious discontent, were by no means such as impel great masses of men to stake their lives, their fortunes, and the welfare of their families against 20 fearful odds. The taxation, though heavier than it had been under the Stuarts, was not heavy when compared with that of the neighbouring states and with the resources of England. Property was secure. Even the Cavalier, who refrained from giving dis- 25 turbance to the new settlement, enjoyed in peace whatever the civil troubles had left him. The laws were violated only in cases where the safety of the Protector's person and government was concerned. Justice was administered between man and man with 30 an exactness and purity not before known. Under no English government since the Reformation, had there been so little religious persecution. The unfortunate Roman Catholics, indeed, were held to be scarcely within the pale of Christian charity. But 35 the clergy of the fallen Anglican Church were suffered to celebrate their worship on condition that they

would abstain from preaching about politics. Even the Jews, whose public worship had, ever since the thirteenth century, been interdicted, were, in spite of the strong opposition of jealous traders and fanatical theologians, permitted to build a synagogue in 5 London.

The Protector's foreign policy at the same time extorted the ungracious approbation of those who most detested him. The Cavaliers could scarcely refrain from wishing that one who had done so much 10 to raise the fame of the nation had been a legitimate King; and the Republicans were forced to own that the tyrant suffered none but himself to wrong his country, and that, if he had robbed her of liberty, he had at least given her glory in exchange. After half 15 a century during which England had been of scarcely more weight in European politics than Venice or Saxony, she at once became the most formidable power in the world, dictated terms of peace to the United Provinces, avenged the common injuries of 20 Christendom on the pirates of Barbary, vanquished the Spaniards by land and sea, seized one of the finest West Indian islands, and acquired on the Flemish coast a fortress which consoled the national pride for the loss of Calais. She was supreme on the ocean. 25 She was the head of the Protestant interest. All the reformed Churches scattered over Roman Catholic kingdoms acknowledged Cromwell as their guardian. The Huguenots of Languedoc, the shepherds who, in the hamlets of the Alps, professed a Protestantism 30 older than that of Augsburg, were secured from oppression by the mere terror of his great name. The Pope himself was forced to preach humanity and moderation to Popish princes. For a voice which seldom threatened in vain had declared that, unless favour were 35 shown to the people of God, the English guns should be heard in the Castle of Saint Angelo. In truth

there was nothing which Cromwell had, for his own sake and that of his family, so much reason to desire as a general religious war in Europe. In such a war he must have been the captain of the Protestant armies. The heart of England would have been with him. His victories would have been hailed with an unanimous enthusiasm unknown in the country since the rout of the Armada, and would have effaced the stain which one act, condemned by the general voice of the nation, has left on his splendid fame. Unhappily for him he had no opportunity of displaying his admirable military talents, except against the inhabitants of the British isles.

While he lived his power stood firm, an object of mingled aversion, admiration, and dread to his subjects. Few indeed loved his government; but those who hated it most hated it less than they feared it. Had it been a worse government, it might perhaps have been overthrown in spite of all its strength. Had it been a weaker government, it would certainly have been overthrown in spite of all its merits. But it had moderation enough to abstain from those oppressions which drive men mad; and it had a force and energy which none but men driven mad by oppression would venture to encounter.

It has often been affirmed, but with little reason, that Oliver died at a time fortunate for his renown, and that, if his life had been prolonged, it would probably have closed amidst disgraces and disasters. It is certain that he was, to the last, honoured by his soldiers, obeyed by the whole population of the British islands, and dreaded by all foreign powers, that he was laid among the ancient sovereigns of England with funeral pomp such as London had never before seen, and that he was succeeded by his son Richard as quietly as any King had ever been succeeded by any Prince of Wales.

During five months, the administration of Richard Cromwell went on so tranquilly and regularly that all Europe believed him to be firmly established on the chair of state. In truth his situation was in some respects much more advantageous than that of his father. The young man had made no enemy. His hands were unstained by civil blood. The Cavaliers themselves allowed him to be an honest, good-natured gentleman. The Presbyterian party, powerful both in numbers and in wealth, had been at a deadly feud with the late Protector, but was disposed to regard the present Protector with favour. That party had always been desirous to see the old civil polity of the realm restored with some clearer definitions and some stronger safeguards for public liberty, but had many reasons for dreading the restoration of the old family. Richard was the very man for politicians of this description. His humanity, ingenuousness, and modesty, the mediocrity of his abilities, and the docility with which he submitted to the guidance of persons wiser than himself, admirably qualified him to be the head of a limited monarchy.

For a time it seemed highly probable that he would, under the direction of able advisers, effect what his father had attempted in vain. A Parliament was called, and the writs were directed after the old fashion. The small boroughs which had recently been disfranchised regained their lost privilege: Manchester, Leeds, and Halifax ceased to return members; and the county of York was again limited to two knights. It may seem strange to a generation which has been excited almost to madness by the question of parliamentary reform that great shires and towns should have submitted with patience, and even with complacency, to this change: but though speculative men might, even in that age, discern the vices of the old representative system, and predict that those vices

would, sooner or later, produce serious practical evil, the practical evil had not yet been felt. Oliver's representative system, on the other hand, though constructed on sound principles, was not popular. Both the events in which it originated, and the effects 5 which it had produced, prejudiced men against it. It had sprung from military violence. It had been fruitful of nothing but disputes. The whole nation was sick of government by the sword, and pined for government by the law. The restoration, therefore, 10 even of anomalies and abuses, which were in strict conformity with the law, and which had been destroyed by the sword, gave general satisfaction.

Among the Commons there was a strong opposition, consisting partly of avowed Republicans, and 15 partly of concealed Royalists: but a large and steady majority appeared to be favourable to the plan of reviving the old civil constitution under a new dynasty. Richard was solemnly recognised as first magistrate. The Commons not only consented to transact business 20 with Oliver's Lords, but passed a vote acknowledging the right of those nobles who had, in the late troubles, taken the side of public liberty, to sit in the Upper House of Parliament without any new creation.

Thus far the statesmen by whose advice Richard 25 acted had been successful. Almost all the parts of the government were now constituted as they had been constituted at the commencement of the civil war. Had the Protector and the Parliament been suffered to proceed undisturbed, there can be little 30 doubt that an order of things similar to that which was afterwards established under the House of Hanover would have been established under the House of Cromwell. But there was in the state a power more than sufficient to deal with Protector and 35 Parliament together. Over the soldiers Richard had no authority except that which he derived from the

great name which he had inherited. He had never led them to victory. He had never even borne arms. All his tastes and habits were pacific. Nor were his opinions and feelings on religious subjects approved by the military saints. That he was a good man he 5
evinced by proofs more satisfactory than deep groans or long sermons, by humility and suavity when he was at the height of human greatness, and by cheerful resignation under cruel wrongs and misfortunes : but the cant then common in every guardroom gave him 10
a disgust which he had not always the prudence to conceal. The officers who had the principal influence among the troops stationed near London were not his friends. They were men distinguished by valour and 15
conduct in the field, but destitute of the wisdom and civil courage which had been conspicuous in their deceased leader. Some of them were honest, but fanatical, Independents and Republicans. Of this class Fleetwood was the representative. Others were impatient to be what Oliver had been. His rapid 20
elevation, his prosperity and glory, his inauguration in the Hall, and his gorgeous obsequies in the Abbey, had inflamed their imagination. They were as well born as he, and as well educated : they could not understand why they were not as worthy to wear the 25
purple robe, and to wield the sword of state ; and they pursued the objects of their wild ambition, not, like him, with patience, vigilance, sagacity, and determination, but with the restlessness and irresolution characteristic of aspiring mediocrity. Among these 30
feeble copies of a great original the most conspicuous was Lambert.

On the very day of Richard's accession the officers began to conspire against their new master. The good understanding which existed between him and 35
his Parliament hastened the crisis. Alarm and resentment spread through the camp. Both the religious

and the professional feelings of the army were deeply wounded. It seemed that the Independents were to be subjected to the Presbyterians, and that the men of the sword were to be subjected to the men of the gown. A coalition was formed between the military 5 malecontents and the republican minority of the House of Commons. It may well be doubted whether Richard could have triumphed over that coalition, even if he had inherited his father's clear judgment and iron courage. It is certain that simplicity and 10 meekness like his were not the qualities which the conjuncture required. He fell ingloriously, and without a struggle. He was used by the army as an instrument for the purpose of dissolving the Parliament, and was then contemptuously thrown aside. The 15 officers gratified their republican allies by declaring that the expulsion of the Rump had been illegal, and by inviting that assembly to resume its functions. The old Speaker and a quorum of the old members came together, and were proclaimed, amidst the 20 scarcely stifled derision and execration of the whole nation, the supreme power in the commonwealth. It was at the same time expressly declared that there should be no first magistrate, and no House of Lords.

But this state of things could not last. On the 25 day on which the Long Parliament revived, revived also its old quarrel with the army. Again the Rump forgot that it owed its existence to the pleasure of the soldiers, and began to treat them as subjects. Again the doors of the House of Commons were closed by 30 military violence; and a provisional government, named by the officers, assumed the direction of affairs.

Meanwhile the sense of great evils, and the strong apprehension of still greater evils close at 35 hand, had at length produced an alliance between the Cavaliers and the Presbyterians. Some Presby-

terians had, indeed, been disposed to such an alliance even before the death of Charles the First: but it was not till after the fall of Richard Cromwell that the whole party became eager for the restoration of the royal house. There was no longer any reasonable 5 hope that the old constitution could be reestablished under a new dynasty. One choice only was left, the Stuarts or the army. The banished family had committed great faults; but it had dearly expiated those faults, and had undergone a long, and, it might 10 be hoped, a salutary training in the school of adversity. It was probable that Charles the Second would take warning by the fate of Charles the First. But, be this as it might, the dangers which threatened the country were such that, in order to avert them, 15 some opinions might well be compromised, and some risks might well be incurred. It seemed but too likely that England would fall under the most odious and degrading of all kinds of government, under a government uniting all the evils of despotism to all 20 the evils of anarchy. Anything was preferable to the yoke of a succession of incapable and inglorious tyrants, raised to power, like the Deys of Barbary, by military revolutions recurring at short intervals. Lambert seemed likely to be the first of these rulers; 25 but within a year Lambert might give place to Desborough, and Desborough to Harrison. As often as the truncheon was transferred from one feeble hand to another, the nation would be pillaged for the purpose of bestowing a fresh donative on the troops. 30 If the Presbyterians obstinately stood aloof from the Royalists, the state was lost; and men might well doubt whether, by the combined exertions of Presbyterians and Royalists, it could be saved. For the dread of that invincible army was on all the inhabi- 35 tants of the island; and the Cavaliers, taught by a hundred disastrous fields how little numbers can

effect against discipline, were even more completely cowed than the Roundheads.

While the soldiers remained united, all the plots and risings of the malecontents were ineffectual. But a few days after the second expulsion of the Rump, came tidings which gladdened the hearts of all who were attached either to monarchy or to liberty. That mighty force which had, during many years, acted as one man, and which, while so acting, had been found irresistible, was at length divided against itself. The army of Scotland had done good service to the Commonwealth, and was in the highest state of efficiency. It had borne no part in the late revolutions, and had seen them with indignation resembling the indignation which the Roman legions posted on the Danube and the Euphrates felt, when they learned that the empire had been put up to sale by the Prætorian Guards. It was intolerable that certain regiments should, merely because they happened to be quartered near Westminster, take on themselves to make and unmake several governments in the course of half a year. If it were fit that the state should be regulated by the soldiers, those soldiers who upheld the English ascendancy on the north of the Tweed were as well entitled to a voice as those who garrisoned the Tower of London. There appears to have been less fanaticism among the troops stationed in Scotland than in any other part of the army; and their general, George Monk, was himself the very opposite of a zealot. He had, at the commencement of the civil war, borne arms for the King, had been made prisoner by the Roundheads, had then accepted a commission from the Parliament, and, with very slender pretensions to saintship, had raised himself to high commands by his courage and professional skill. He had been an useful servant to both the Protectors, had quietly acquiesced when the officers

at Westminster pulled down Richard and restored the Long Parliament, and would perhaps have acquiesced as quietly in the second expulsion of the Long Parliament, if the provisional government had abstained from giving him cause of offence and apprehension. For his nature was cautious and somewhat sluggish; nor was he at all disposed to hazard sure and moderate advantages for the chance of obtaining even the most splendid success. He seems to have been impelled to attack the new 10 rulers of the Commonwealth less by the hope that, if he overthrew them, he should become great, than by the fear that, if he submitted to them, he should not even be secure. Whatever were his motives, he declared himself the champion of the oppressed 15 civil power, refused to acknowledge the usurped authority of the provisional government, and, at the head of seven thousand veterans, marched into England.

This step was the signal for a general explosion. 20 The people everywhere refused to pay taxes. The apprentices of the City assembled by thousands and clamoured for a free Parliament. The fleet sailed up the Thames, and declared against the tyranny of the soldiers. The soldiers, no longer under the control 25 of one commanding mind, separated into factions. Every regiment, afraid lest it should be left alone a mark for the vengeance of the oppressed nation, hastened to make a separate peace. Lambert, who had hastened northward to encounter the army of 30 Scotland, was abandoned by his troops, and became a prisoner. During thirteen years the civil power had, in every conflict, been compelled to yield to the military power. The military power now humbled itself before the civil power. The Rump, generally 35 hated and despised, but still the only body in the country which had any show of legal authority,

returned again to the house from which it had been twice ignominiously expelled.

In the mean time Monk was advancing towards London. Wherever he came, the gentry flocked round him, imploring him to use his power for the purpose of restoring peace and liberty to the distracted nation. The General, coldblooded, taciturn, 5 zealous for no polity and for no religion, maintained an impenetrable reserve. What were at this time his plans, and whether he had any plan, may well be doubted. His great object, apparently, was to keep himself, as long as possible, free to choose between several lines of action. Such, indeed, is commonly the policy of men who are, like him, distinguished rather by wariness than by farsightedness. It was 15 probably not till he had been some days in the capital that he had made up his mind. The cry of the whole people was for a free Parliament; and there could be no doubt that a Parliament really free would instantly restore the exiled family. The Rump and the soldiers were still hostile to the House of Stuart. But the Rump was universally detested and despised. The power of the soldiers was indeed still formidable, but had been greatly diminished by discord. They had no head. They had recently 25 been, in many parts of the country, arrayed against each other. On the very day before Monk reached London, there was a fight in the Strand between the cavalry and the infantry. An united army had long kept down a divided nation; but the nation was now 30 united, and the army was divided.

During a short time the dissimulation or irresolution of Monk kept all parties in a state of painful suspense. At length he broke silence, and declared for a free Parliament.

35

As soon as his declaration was known, the whole nation was wild with delight. Wherever he appeared

thousands thronged round him, shouting and blessing his name. The bells of all England rang joyously : the gutters ran with ale ; and, night after night, the sky five miles round London was reddened by innumerable bonfires. Those Presbyterian members of the House of Commons who had many years before been expelled by the army, returned to their seats, and were hailed with acclamations by great multitudes, which filled Westminster Hall and Palace Yard. The Independent leaders no longer dared to show their faces in the streets, and were scarcely safe within their own dwellings. Temporary provision was made for the government : writs were issued for a general election ; and then that memorable Parliament, which had, in the course of twenty eventful years, experienced every variety of fortune, which had triumphed over its sovereign, which had been enslaved and degraded by its servants, which had been twice ejected and twice restored, solemnly decreed its own dissolution.

The result of the elections was such as might have been expected from the temper of the nation. The new House of Commons consisted, with few exceptions, of persons friendly to the royal family. The Presbyterians formed the majority.

That there would be a restoration now seemed almost certain ; but whether there would be a peaceable restoration was matter of painful doubt. The soldiers were in a gloomy and savage mood. They hated the title of King. They hated the name of Stuart. They hated Presbyterianism much, and Prelacy more. They saw with bitter indignation that the close of their long domination was approaching, and that a life of inglorious toil and penury was before them. They attributed their ill fortune to the weakness of some generals, and to the treason of others. One hour of their beloved Oliver might even

now restore the glory which had departed. Betrayed, disunited, and left without any chief in whom they could confide, they were yet to be dreaded. It was no light thing to encounter the rage and despair of fifty thousand fighting men, whose backs no enemy had ever seen. Monk, and those with whom he acted, were well aware that the crisis was most perilous. They employed every art to soothe and to divide the discontented warriors. At the same time vigorous preparation was made for a conflict. The army of Scotland, now quartered in London, was kept in good humour by bribes, praises, and promises. The wealthy citizens grudged nothing to a red coat, and were indeed so liberal of their best wine, that warlike saints were sometimes seen in a condition not very honourable either to their religious or to their military character. Some refractory regiments Monk ventured to disband. In the meantime the greatest exertions were made by the provisional government, with the strenuous aid of the whole body of the gentry and magistracy, to organise the militia. In every county the trainbands were held ready to march; and this force cannot be estimated at less than a hundred and twenty thousand men. In Hyde Park twenty thousand citizens, well armed and accoutred, passed in review, and showed a spirit which justified the hope that, in case of need, they would fight manfully for their shops and firesides. The fleet was heartily with the nation. It was a stirring time, a time of anxiety, yet of hope. The prevailing opinion was that England would be delivered, but not without a desperate and bloody struggle, and that the class which had so long ruled by the sword would perish by the sword.

Happily the dangers of a conflict were averted. There was indeed one moment of extreme peril. Lambert escaped from his confinement, and called

his comrades to arms. The flame of civil war was actually rekindled ; but by prompt and vigorous exertion it was trodden out before it had time to spread. The luckless imitator of Cromwell was again a prisoner. The failure of his enterprise damped the spirit of the soldiers ; and they sullenly resigned themselves to their fate. 5

The new Parliament, which, having been called without the royal writ, is more accurately described as a Convention, met at Westminster. The Lords repaired to the hall, from which they had, during more than eleven years, been excluded by force. Both Houses instantly invited the King to return to his country. He was proclaimed with pomp never before known. A gallant fleet convoyed him from Holland to the coast of Kent. When he landed, the cliffs of Dover were covered by thousands of gazers, among whom scarcely one could be found who was not weeping with delight. The journey to London was a continued triumph. The whole road from Rochester was bordered by booths and tents, and looked like an interminable fair. Everywhere flags were flying, bells and music sounding, wine and ale flowing in rivers to the health of him whose return was the return of peace, of law, and of freedom. But in the midst of the general joy, one spot presented a dark and threatening aspect. On Blackheath the army was drawn up to welcome the sovereign. He smiled, bowed, and extended his hand graciously to the lips of the colonels and majors. But all his courtesy was vain. The countenances of the soldiers were sad and lowering ; and had they given way to their feelings, the festive pageant of which they reluctantly made a part would have had a mournful and bloody end. But there was no concert among them. Discord and defection had left them no confidence in their chiefs or in each other. The whole array of the 35

City of London was under arms. Numerous companies of militia had assembled from various parts of the realm, under the command of loyal noblemen and gentlemen, to welcome the King. That great day closed in peace ; and the restored wanderer reposed 5 safe in the palace of his ancestors.

NOTES.

P 1, l. 3 **Within the memory.** Macaulay died before he had brought the History down to the death of Henry III. He had intended bringing it down to the death of George IV.

P 2, l. 27 **Two important dependencies,** the North American Colonies and Ireland.

P 2, l. 35 **Body politic,** the nation in its corporate character, the state.

"This realm of England is an empire governed by one supreme head and king . . . unto whom a body politic compact of all sorts and degrees of people . . . been bounden"—*Act, Henry VIII*, 12.

P. 3, l. 2 **Chequered,** marked with alternate light and shade; originally having alternate colours like a chess-board (*cf check-mate*)

P 3, l. 5. **The last hundred and sixty years.** A hundred and sixty years from the time when Macaulay was writing would carry him back to the date of the Revolution, 1688

P. 3, l 14. **Battles and sieges.** Macaulay's views of what history should be are set forth at length in an article which appeared in *The Edinburgh Review* for May, 1828 See *Writings and Speeches* (Student's Edition), 133.

P. 5, l. 2. **Alaric,** leader of the Visigoths. He sacked Rome in 410; his successors established the West Gothic kingdom, which comprised the greater part of Spain and Gaul south of the Loire.

P. 5, l. 3. **Theodoric,** leader of the Ostrogoths. He conquered Italy and founded the East Gothic kingdom, *d* 526.

P. 5, l 3 **Clovis,** became in 481 king of the Salian Franks. His kingdom extended from the Loire to beyond the Rhine.

P. 5, l. 3 **Alboin,** the founder of the Lombard kingdom in Italy. He succeeded his father in 561 when the Lombards were still settled in Pannonia (the country south of the Danube)

P. 5, l. 4. **Ida,** an Anglian chieftain who in 547 became king of Bernicia (the country between the Tees and the Forth).

P. 5, l 4. **Cerdic,** a Saxon chieftain who led an invasion of Southern Britain in 495 and founded the kingdom of Wessex in 519.

P. 5, l. 7. **Paris, Toledo, Arles, and Ravenna.** Macaulay gives these four towns as the seats of government of the four Teutonic conquerors whom he has mentioned, and appears to associate Paris with Clovis, Toledo with Alaric, and Ravenna with Theodoric. It is not clear what connection he found between Arles and Alboin.

P. 5, l. 10. **Nicene theology**, the theology embodied in the Nicene creed adopted in 325 by the first general council of Nicæa, in opposition to the heresy of Arius. The form in which the creed appears in the Communion Service of the Church of England was adopted by the second general council at Constantinople in 381.

That the barbarian conquerors "took part eagerly in disputes touching the Nicene theology" is illustrated by the fact that Clovis attacked, defeated, and slew Alaric II. for being an Arian.

P. 5, l. 19. **Diocletian**, the Emperor, who after a reign of twenty-one years, abdicated in 304, spent vast sums in buildings at Rome and Nicomedia.

P. 5, l. 19. **Constantine**, the Great, who died in 337 after a reign of thirty-one years, founded the city called in honour of him Constantinople.

P. 5, l. 21. **Polycletus**, reckoned the most skilful sculptor, and **Apelles**, the most skilful painter, among the ancients.

P. 5, l. 27. **Bosporus**, meaning literally Oxford, received its name from the legend that Io, transformed into a cow, swam across it. Constantinople, the capital of the Eastern Empire, stood on it.

P. 5, l. 29. **Scylla** is described in the *Odyssey* as a sea monster with six heads. Her lower half lay in a dark cavern, if a ship came near she snatched a man off it with each of her heads. Opposite her, at the distance of a bow shot, was a rock having under it the whirlpool of Charybdis, which three times a day sucked in the sea.

P. 5, l. 30. **Læstrygonian cannibals**. Homer makes Ulysses, in his passage from the Island of Æolus to the Island of Circe, visit the Læstrygones, who devoured some of his crew.

P. 5, l. 31. **Procopius**, the greatest of the Byzantine historians. He was secretary to Belisarius, and a favourite of the Emperor Justinian. The value of his writings is not to be judged from the marvels which he relates (in all good faith) about our island. His account is quoted at length by Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, iv. 230.

P. 6, l. 4. **Belisarius**, a great general under Justinian.

P. 6, l. 4. **Simplicius**, a philosopher of the sixth century who taught at Athens till Justinian closed the schools.

P. 6, l. 5. **Tribonian**, one of the chief workers under Justinian in codifying the laws.

P. 6, l. 6. **Country . . . purple**. Constantine the Great, the founder of Constantinople, wrote on the death of his father at York in 306, to inform the Emperor of the East that "the affectionate violence of his troops had not permitted him to solicit the imperial purple in the regular constitutional manner".

P. 6, l. 11. **Odoacer**, the chief of the Germanic Scyrrî, extinguished the Western Empire in 476 and ruled Italy till 493, nominally as subject to the Eastern Emperor Zeno.

P. 6, l. 11. **Totila**, king of the Ostrogoths. He successfully withstood Belisarius, who was sent to subdue Italy for Justinian, but he was defeated and slain by Narses in 552.

P. 6, l. 12. **Euric** brought the Visigothic kingdom up to its largest extent by driving the Sueves into a corner of Spain, conquering the last Roman provinces in Central Gaul, and receiving Provence from the hands of Odoacer, King of Italy. He died in 485.

P. 6, l. 12. **Thrasimund**. About the beginning of the fifth century the Vandals, moving from Pannonia, traversed Gaul, occupied a large tract of Spain (still called after them *Andalusia*), crossed the sea, and, overthrowing the Roman power in North Africa, made Carthage the seat of their power. Thrasimund (who reigned from 496 to 528) was the greatest and most accomplished of their kings.

P. 6, l. 12. **Fredegunda** and **Brunechild** were the wives of the brothers Chilperic and Sigibert, who, after the death of their father in 561, divided the Merovingian kingdom. Both women were famous for their abilities and their crimes.

P. 6, l. 14. **Hengist . . . Mordred**. Hengist, Horsa, and Vortigern are mentioned under the year 449 in our oldest historical document, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Geoffrey of Monmouth, in his *British History*, mentions Rowena (Bohn's "Six Old English Chronicles," 186), Arthur (225 *et seq.*) and Mordred (268-272), but this is no presumption of their existence, as Geoffrey deals more in legend than in history. For the fifteenth century form of the legend, see Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*, for a poetical rendering of the same, see Tenyson's *Idylls of the King*; and for a scientific discussion, see Rhys's *Studies in the Arthurian Legend*.

P. 6, l. 20. **Saxon**. The influence of the late E. A. Freeman has led to the abandoning of the use of *Saxon* as a general name for the Teutonic conquerors of Britain, though it has not led to the adoption of the term which he preferred, *English*.

P. 6, l. 29. **Syrian asceticism**. The word *ascetic* (Gr. *askētikos*, given to exercise) was applied by the Greek fathers to those who exercised themselves in a contemplation of divine things, and for that purpose separated themselves from all company with the world. Syria was famous for the number of its hermits and the austerities which they practised.

P. 7, l. 9. **Dunstan** (924-988), successively Abbot of Glastonbury, Bishop of Worcester, Bishop of London, and Archbishop of Canterbury; chief adviser to Kings Edmund, Edred, and Edgar.

P. 7, l. 9. **Penda**, the greatest King of the Mercians, and the champion of heathendom against Christianity; defeated and slain in 655.

P. 7, l. 17. **In our Saxon chronicles, e.g. —**

"688 This year Ina succeeded to the kingdom of the West Saxons and held it thirty-seven years . . . and he afterwards went to Rome and there dwelt to the end of his days."

"704 This year Ethelred, the son of Penda, King of the Mercians, became a monk, and he had held the kingdom twenty-nine years; then Kenred succeeded to it."

"709. This year . . . Kenred went to Rome . . . and Kenred was there till the end of his life."

P. 9, l. 13. **What . . . Hebrides**. As all Greeks from the colony of

Trapezus (Trebizond) in the south-east of the Euxine (Black) Sea to the colony of Massalia (Marseilles) joined in celebrating the games in honour of Zeus at Olympia and in consulting the Pythian Apóllō at Delphos, so all the nations from Calabria (in Southern Italy) to the Hebrides joined in a common worship. The Christians of the East belonged to the Greek Church, not to the "Latin communion" or Church of Rome.

P. 9, l. 31. **Livy and Sallust**, Roman historians.

P. 9, l. 33. **Aqueducts**. Rome had fourteen aqueducts, having a total length of more than 350 miles. These are among the most striking features of modern Rome and still serve their ancient purpose.

P. 9, l. 33. **Temples**. Ancient Rome is said to have had more than three hundred temples.

P. 9, l. 34. **The dome of Agrippa**. This dome, greater in diameter than the dome of St. Peter's, was erected by Agrippa in B.C. 27. Pliny and other writers called it the Pantheon. It is now called S. Maria Rotonda, having been consecrated in 608 as the Church of St. Maria ad Martyres.

P. 9, l. 34. **Still glittering with bronze**. When Pope Urban VIII. (one of the family of the Barberini) took the bronze from the Pantheon to make an altar a pasquinade said "Quod non fecerunt Barbari fecerunt Barberini".

P. 9, l. 35. **The mausoleum of Adrian**, now called the Castle of San Angelo, was erected by Hadrian. It consists of a circular tower on a square basement and was once highly decorated but the statues were thrown down by the Romans on the besieging Gauls.

P. 9, l. 35. **Mausoleum**, a splendid tomb, so called from the monument erected by his Queen to Mausolus, King of Caria.

P. 9, l. 36. **The Flavian amphitheatre**, or Colosseum, accommodated 87,000 spectators. It was begun by Vespasian, consecrated by Titus, and finished by Domitian (all three of the Flavian gens). In its present state it is what Byron called—

A noble wreck in ruinous perfection.

P. 9, l. 37. **Degraded into a quarry**. Stones were taken from it for the erection of buildings elsewhere.

P. 10, l. 10 **The Augustan age**, the age of Augustus Cæsar, when Horace, Virgil, Ovid, Propertius, Tibullus, and other great writers flourished.

P. 10, l. 12 **Bede** (673-735), author of the *Ecclesiastical History*, spent most of his life in the Abbey of Jarrow.

P. 10, l. 12. **Alcuin** (735-804) was educated in the cloister school at York; assisted Charlemagne (Charles the Great) in his educational reforms, wrote metrical annals and philosophical works.

P. 10, l. 34. **Six generations**. From the first Danish raid in 787 to the accession of Canute in 1017 is a period of 230 years, and Macaulay therefore takes a generation to be about 40 years.

P. 11, l. 19. **The Carlovingian empire**, the empire of the Carlovingians or Karlings, the second dynasty of Frankish kings. The line

received its name from Charlemagne (Charles the Great), who in 800 was proclaimed Emperor of the West.

P. 11, l. 20. **Maestricht** (Maastricht on the Maas in Holland) was destroyed in 882

P. 11, l. 20. **Paris** was besieged by Rollo in 885.

P. 11, l. 20. **One of the feeble heirs**, Charles the Simple, King of France from 893 to 929, granted to Rollo by the treaty of Clair on Epte in 912 the territories which were already his own.

P. 11, l. 22. **A fertile province**, Normandy.

P. 12, l. 31. **One Norman knight**, Richard de Clare (Strongbow) Earl of Pembroke, whose interference in an Irish quarrel in 1168 led to the acquisition of Ireland by the English.

P. 12, l. 33. **Another**, Robert Guiscard (the Wise) one of the twelve sons of Tancred of Hauteville. The conquest of Sicily was entrusted by him to his brother Roger.

P. 12, l. 34. **The Two Sicilies**. The Norman kingdom which consisted of the Island of Sicily and the south of Italy underwent many divisions and reunions. For a century and a half from the days of Philip II it was, under the name of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, part of the great Spanish monarchy.

P. 12, l. 34. **The emperors both of the East and of the West**. Guiscard defeated Alexius, the emperor of the East, at Durazzo in 1081.

P. 12, l. 35. **A third**, Bohemond, the son of Robert Guiscard. Macaulay calls him "the Ulysses of the first Crusade," because he was distinguished from the other leaders as Ulysses was distinguished from the other besiegers of Troy by being something more than a brave warrior. "In the person of this Norman chief we may seek for the coolest policy and ambition, with a small alloy of religious fanaticism."—*Gibbon*.

Bohemond was "invested by his fellow soldiers with the sovereignty of Antioch" on the capture of the city in 1098

P. 13, l. 1. **A fourth**. Tancred was the nephew of Robert Guiscard (and therefore the cousin of Bohemond).

P. 13, l. 1. **The great poem**, *Jerusalem Delivered*, the greatest of all the artificial epics after the *Aeneid* and *Paradise Lost*.

P. 13, l. 2. **Christendom** (*Christian-dom*), the countries professing Christianity, taken collectively.

P. 13, l. 11. **The court of Rouen**. The court of William (afterwards the Conqueror) was to the court of Edward the Confessor what the court of Louis XIV was to the court of Charles II.

P. 13, l. 26. **Even the sports**. "It is plain that William's excessive love of hunting, the cruel laws by which his savage pleasures were fenced in, the pitiless havoc of which he was guilty to find means for their gratification, were something which was new to Englishmen."—*Freeman*.

P. 14, l. 3. **A person of French extraction**. "The men whom I have brought with me or who have come after me," are the words of William's law.

P. 14, l. 14. **The homage of Scotland.** Malcolm Canmore did formal homage to William.

P. 14, l. 19. **Arabian chroniclers.** These are largely quoted by Stanley Lane-Poole in his *Saladin* (Heroes of the Nations), and by T. A. Archer in *The Crusade of Richard I.*

P. 14, l. 20. **The fall of Acre.** Acre was surrendered to Richard of England and Philip of France during the Third Crusade in 1191. An eye-witness of the events to which Macaulay alludes gives a very full and graphic account of them in his *Itinerary of Richard I.*, Books III and IV. An excellent modern account of them is given by Lane-Poole in his *Saladin.*

P. 14, l. 22. **Arabian mothers.** "The King of England . . . was so dreaded that . . . when their [the Saracens'] children wept they would say to them, 'Be quiet, the King of England is coming', and if their horses started they would jestingly say, 'Is the King of England in front of us then?'"—*Les Livres Eracles.*

P. 14, l. 23. **The lionhearted Plantagenet,** Richard Cœur-de-Lion.

P. 14, l. 24. **Hugh Capet** was King of France from 987 to 996. He was the founder of the Capetian dynasty, and the history of France as a kingdom may be said to begin with him.

P. 14, l. 25. **Merovingian.** The Merovingians or Merwings were the first dynasty of Frankish kings in Gaul. The name is derived from Merwig, King of the Western or Salian Franks from 448 to 557. The line gave way to the Carolingians. See note to p. 11, l. 19.

P. 14, l. 35. **A Haytian negro.** The Island of Hayti, Hispaniola, or San Domingo was largely peopled with negro slaves after Spanish cruelties had destroyed the original inhabitants. The western portion, which the French had seized some time before, was confirmed to them by the Treaty of Ryswick in 1697. The slave of a French master would have no share in the glory or shame of France.

P. 15, l. 9. **One of the ablest among them,** Henry I.

P. 15, l. 11. **An English princess,** Eadgyth or Maud, the daughter of Malcolm, King of the Scots, and of Margaret, the grand-daughter of Edmund Ironside.

P. 15, l. 14. **Quadroon,** one who has a quarter of negro blood,—the offspring of a white and a mulatto.

P. 15, l. 17. **A Saxon nickname,** Godric. The nickname of the queen was Godiva. A nickname=an eke (additional) name.

P. 16, l. 5. **The seventh,** John.

P. 16, l. 14. **A prince,** Philip II. (Philip Augustus).

P. 18, l. 16 **The imperial jurisprudence,** the laws of the Roman Empire, which became the foundation of the laws of all Christian nations.

P. 18, l. 18. **The Cinque Ports.** The five ports from which the name is derived are Hastings, Romney, Hythe, Dover, and Sandwich. Winchelsea and Rye were afterwards added to them. The duty of protecting the coast from foreign attacks was assigned to them, and they were, in return, granted certain privileges.

P. 18, l. 19. **The most ancient colleges.** University, Balliol, and Merton at Oxford and Peterhouse at Cambridge were founded in the thirteenth century.

P. 18, l. 26. **Dawn of that noble literature.** The only thirteenth century works now read (and those only by students who make a special study of the period) are Rolle of Hampole's *Pricke of Conscience* and Layamon's *Brut*.

P. 19, l. 7. **The House of Valois.** On the death of Charles VI., the last of the Capets, in 1328, without son or surviving brother, the crown would, but for the Salic Law, have come to the son of his sister Isabel, the English King Edward III. Charles was succeeded by Philip VI., his cousin, son of the Count and first of the kings of the House of Valois.

P. 20, l. 12. **Chandos . . . Du Guesclin.** Sir John Chandos is chosen by Macaulay as the best example of an English knight, and Bertrand d . . . as the best example of a French knight. Du Guesclin became Chandos' prisoner at the Battle of Auray in 1346.

P. 20, l. 15. **A French King, John II.**

P. 20, l. 16. **An English King, Henry VI.**

P. 20, l. 17. **Beyond the Pyrenees and the Alps.** This is explained in the following lines.

P. 20, l. 19. **Won a great battle at Navarette in 1367.** Pedro the Cruel was restored to the throne of Castile by the victory which Edward the Black Prince won for him.

P. 20, l. 22. **Bands of warriors.** When peace had been made between France and England in 1360, the "three Companies, bands of hired soldiers who had served the French and English kings in the last campaigns, became a terror . . . Ingleram of Courcy brought one band of them, the Guglers, through Burgundy into Switzerland. . . . Sir John Hawkwood took the White Company into Italy and served the city of Florence with them till his death. The Great Company went to Avignon and made the Pope pay them a large sum".—*York Powell*.

P. 20, l. 32. **New College, Oxford, founded in 1379 by William of Wykeham, the greatest builder amongst bishops**

P. 20, l. 33. **Saint George.** Saint George's Chapel in its present form dates from the reign of Edward IV., though the alterations in the castle of which it formed a part were begun by William of Wykeham for Edward III.

P. 20, l. 33. **The nave of Winchester Cathedral** was transformed by the bishop, William of Wykeham.

P. 20, l. 33. **The choir of York Minster** was begun about 1361.

P. 20, l. 34. **The spire of Salisbury Cathedral, the highest in England (400 feet), was built 1335-75.**

P. 20, l. 35. **Towers of Lincoln.** The three towers of Lincoln Cathedral seem to be earlier than the other buildings mentioned by Macaulay.

P. 21, l. 4. **Valladolid . . . Florence.** See notes to p. 20, ll. 19, 22,

P. 21, l. 11. **Derby.** Henry, son of Henry, Earl of Lancaster, and great-grandson of Henry III.; created Earl of Derby in 1337 and first Duke of Lancaster in 1351. He was the most trusted councillor of Edward III., and honoured as the type of a perfect knight.

P. 21, l. 30 **Gave up the contest.** The French recovered Guienne and Gascony in 1451. Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, in an attempt to dispossess them, was defeated and slain at Châillon in 1453, after which Calais was the only portion of France remaining in the hands of the English.

P. 22, l. 9. **In civil strife.** The Wars of the Roses began within two years of the Battle of Châillon.

P. 22, l. 19. **Comines.** Philippe de Comines was born before 1447, and died in 1511. He was the most trusted councillor of Louis XI., after whose death he mostly lived in retirement. His *Memoires* form a valuable source of information on the history of the period. The passage to which Macaulay refers will be found in I, vii.

P. 22, l. 32. **Bastards.** Henry VII was connected with the House of Lancaster through his mother, Margaret Beaufort, a descendant of John of Gaunt and his mistress, Catherine Swynford.

P. 22, l. 33 **Impostors,** Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck.

P. 23, l. 28 **The days of the Stuarts.** "When tenure in villenage was virtually abolished . . . by the statute of Charles II. there was hardly a pure villein left in the nation"—*Blackstone*.

P. 24, l. 21 **Rio Janeiro . . . Washington.** Rio de Janeiro, in Macaulay's day the capital of the Roman Catholic Brazil, Washington, the capital of the Protestant United States.

P. 24, l. 29 **Raised their voices.** Orderic relates that one high-minded Norman monk, Guttmund, of the Abbey of St. Leutfred, refused to accept any preferment in England "How," he said, "should he dare to rule over men whose fathers, brothers, and friends had been slain, imprisoned, or exiled by the king? . . . How could he . . . consent to share in the spoils of war?"

P. 25, l. 4 **Nicholas Breakspear,** Adrian IV., the only Englishman who ever became pope, *d* 1159.

P. 25, l. 11. **May be doubted.** William FitzStephen, who was chaplain to Becket, says he was born "of gentle parents, his father being Gilbert, who was sometime Sheriff of London, and his mother Matilda, London citizens of the middle class".

That the parents were "London citizens" in the days of Henry I. does not prove that they were English born, and in fact the father is said to have sprung from a family of knightly rank at Thierceville, and the mother from a burgher family at Caen.

P. 25, l. 21. **Testimony.** "*De Republica Anglorum*, the manner of government of the Realm of England, compiled by the honourable man, Thomas Smyth, Doctor of the Civil Laws, Knight, and Principal Secretary unto the two most worthy Princes, Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth" (1583).

P. 27, l. 20. **States General,** the name given in France before 1789 to the assembly of the deputies of the three orders of the nation—the

clergy, the nobility, and the *tiers état*. The states of Brittany and the states of Burgundy had shared with the dukes in the government before those two duchies were incorporated in the kingdom of France.

P. 27, l. 23 **Sanhedrim**, the highest court of the Jews in matters of religion and morals.

P. 27, l. 24. **The Amphictyonic Council**. A mythical Amphictyon was said to have taught the Greek tribes to live in peace by getting them to meet periodically at certain sanctuaries for common worship and the transaction of business. The association of tribes was called the Amphictyonic Council.

P. 27, l. 24. **Gulph**. Macaulay here employs an obsolete spelling.

P. 27, l. 32. **When**. In 1788, the method of carrying on the government during the insanity of the king led to heated discussions involving important constitutional questions.

P. 28, l. 4. **Committees were appointed** by the Lords and Commons to search for precedents "of such proceedings as may have been had in case of the personal exercise of the royal authority being prevented or interrupted by infancy, sickness, infirmity or otherwise, with a view to provide for the same".

P. 28, l. 6. **1217 . . . 1326 . . . 1377 . . . 1422**. In 1217 Henry III., in 1377 Richard II., and in 1422 Henry VI. were minors, in 1326 Edward II. was in flight.

P. 28, l. 9. **1455**. The precedent in the reign of Henry VI. was most relied on, for in that case there was a king who was incapacitated by imbecility and a regency which was both ratified and limited by Act of Parliament.

P. 28, l. 30. **Bracton**. Henry de Bracton, an eminent English lawyer of the thirteenth century, wrote *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus*, first printed in 1569. The value set on this work soon after its publication is evinced by the treatises of Britton and Fleta, which are nothing more than the appendages to Bracton. The latter was intended as an epitome of that author.

P. 28, l. 30. **Fleta**, a treatise on English law, written about 1290. The preface says, "This book may be well called *Fleta*, for it was composed in Fleta," which is taken to mean that it was written in the Fleet prison, and the authorship is therefore assigned to one of the corrupt judges whom Edward I. incarcerated.

P. 28, l. 31. **Mirror of Justice**, *La Somme appellé Mirour des Justices, vel Speculum Justiciariorum factum per A. H.* "A. H." was Andrew Horn, chamberlain to the city of London, who died in 1328.

P. 28, l. 31. **Rolls**, official records (originally engrossed on parchment and kept in rolls).

P. 29, l. 11. **Mainwaring**. In 1627 Richard Mainwaring, then rector of St. Giles's in the Fields, preached before Charles I. on Religion and Allegiance. He maintained that if the King made demands for money without consent of Parliament, "very hard would it be for any man in the world that should not accordingly satisfy such demands to defend his conscience from that heavy prejudice of resisting the ordinance of God and receiving to himself damnation," etc. The sermons were

published by order of the King, but the preacher was punished by the Parliament, though he afterwards found his reward in the bishopric of St. David's. See Gardiner, *History of England*, vi. 208.

P. 29, l. 18. **Bradshaw**, president of the court which sentenced Charles I. to death.

P. 29, l. 23. **Doges**. Their power, at first almost unlimited and absolute, was cut down bit by bit, and eventually circumscribed so closely that in later days they were hardly more than lay figures of the great republic over which they were set as governors.

P. 29, l. 36. **Coalition against Islam**, the Crusades.

P. 30, l. 21. **The Estates of the realm**, the lords spiritual, the lords temporal, and the commons, that is the parliament.

P. 31, l. 35. **Canons**, rules (Gk., *kanōn*).

P. 31, l. 37. **Dactyls**, in modern verse feet consisting of one accented followed by two unaccented syllables; as—

Bright-est ānd | bést of thē | sōns of thē | morning.

P. 32, l. 1. **Trochees**, feet consisting of one accented followed by one unaccented syllable; as—

Bét-tēr | six-tȳ | yéars of | Eú-rōpe | thán ā | cȳ-clē | of Cathay.

P. 32, l. 24. **Felony**. By English law every crime (except treason) is either a felony or a misdemeanour. The distinction between the two though sometimes subtle is often practically important. Perjury is a misdemeanour.

P. 32, l. 24. **Gavelkind**, a tenure or custom belonging to lands in the County of Kent whereby the lands of the father are at his death equally divided among all his sons.

P. 32, l. 34. **To annul virtually**. Note that Macaulay does not split the infinitive.

P. 33, l. 14. **In express terms**. "We have granted for us and for our heirs . . . that for no business from henceforth will we take . . . aids, tasks, nor prises but by the common assent of the realm and for the common profit thereof."

P. 33, l. 17. **Attempted to violate the compact in 1332**.

P. 37, l. 21. **Since 1688**.

P. 37, l. 22. **Hundred and sixty years** from 1325 to 1485.

P. 37, l. 24. **Six . . . were deposed**. Edward II., Richard II., Henry VI., Edward V., Richard III., Edward IV. Edward IV. was deposed in 1470 when by the joint attack of Warwick and Clarence he was compelled to seek refuge in Holland.

P. 37, l. 25. **Five lost their lives**. All mentioned in the preceding note except Edward IV.

P. 38, l. 25. **Philip III**, Duke of Burgundy.

P. 38, l. 26. **Lewis**, Louis XII. of France to whom the Estates General of Tours in 1506 gave the surname "father of his people".

P. 39, l. 1. **Confederates of Cambray**, Pope Julius II., the Emperor Maximilian I., Louis XII. of France, and Ferdinand II. of Aragon, who in 1508 united to despoil Venice.

P. 39, l. 3. **The best governed country.** "Selon mon advis, entre toutes les seigneuries du monde dont j'ay congnoissance, où la chose publique est myeulx traictée, où regne moins de violance sur le peuple, où il n'y a nulz edifices abatuz ny desmoliz par guerre, c'est Angleterre; et tumble le sort et malheur sur ceulx qui font la guerre."—(*Mémoires*, V., xix., ed. de Mandrot, i., 444.)

"Ceste grace a ce royaume d'Angleterre par dessus les autres royaumes que le pays ny ne le peuple ne s'en destruit point, ny ne bruslent ny ne desmolissent les edifices, et tumble la fortune sur les gens de guerre, et par especial sur les nobles, contre lesquelz ilz sont trop crueux. Ainsi rien n'est parfaict en ce monde."—(*Ibid.*, V., xx., ed. de Mandrot, i., 454.)

P. 39, l. 34. **Sir John Howard** was afterwards created Duke of Norfolk (the first of the Howard line) and was slain at Bosworth. Macaulay appears mistaken in saying that Sir John married the daughter of Thomas Mowbray. It was Sir John's father, Sir Robert.

P. 39, l. 36. **Sir Richard Pole**, a gentleman of Buckinghamshire, married Margaret, daughter of the Duke of Clarence (brother of Edward IV and Richard III.). Cardinal Pole was their son.

P. 40, l. 4. **Scutcheon** (escutcheon), the shield or shield-shaped surface on which a coat of arms is depicted.

P. 40, l. 10. **Bohuns, Mowbrays, De Veres.** Macaulay selects these as representatives of the noblest families. The founders of the three families came over with the Conqueror. The Bohuns were afterwards Earls of Hereford, Earls of Essex, and Earls of Northampton. There were peers of the title Mowbray till 1400 when Thomas de Mowbray was created Duke of Norfolk. The De Veres were Earls of Oxford from 1155 to 1702.

P. 41, l. 10. **Second title, Lord Russell.** Lord John Russell, son and heir of Francis, Earl of Bedford, was a member of the parliament which assembled in 1572.

P. 42, l. 18. **Lady Salisbury.** See note to p. 39, l. 36. Lady Salisbury was beheaded in 1541.

P. 42, l. 20. **He demanded** in 1526.

P. 42, l. 33. **Predecessors who had perished at Berkeley and Pomfret** (Pontefract), Edward II. and Richard II.

P. 42, l. 36. **Apologised.** Macaulay seems to have had in mind the account in Hall's *Chronicle*, which ends: "Then the king said: 'I will no more of this trouble; let letters be sent to all shires that this matter maie no more be spoken of. I will pardon all them that have denied the demaunde openly or secretly.' Then all the lordes kneeled downe and hartely thanked the kyng. Then letters were sent."

P. 44, l. 3. **Forty days**, the period for which in feudal times men were bound to serve.

P. 44, l. 37. **In France** there was no meeting of the States General from 1614 to 1789, when their meeting was the beginning of the Revolution.

P. 45, l. 5. **Toledo and Valladolid** rose in insurrection in 1520.

P. 45, l. 8. **In the next generation**, in 1591,

P. 45, l. 15. **Convocation** of the provinces of Canterbury and York. These are representative assemblies of the Church. Before the Reformation they had great power, but the Act of Submission in 1533 decreed that they could not meet without the king's writ, and that they could not legislate without his licence. In 1717 Convocation, being at variance with the government, was prorogued, and it was not summoned again till 1852 (Canterbury) and 1856 (York)

P. 46, l. 31. **An event**, the Reformation.

P. 46, l. 36. **The first insurrection**, that of the Albigenes.

P. 47, l. 1. **Francis** of Assisi, who founded the Franciscan order of monks, and **Dominic**, who founded the Dominican order. The first received the sanction of Pope Honorius III. in 1223, and the second in 1216

P. 47, l. 5. **In England** with John Wyclif.

P. 47, l. 5. **To Bohemia** where John Huss was the leader.

P. 47, l. 6. **The Council of Constance** assembled in 1414.

P. 48, l. 6. **Matthias and Kniperdoling**, leaders of the insurrection of the 'Anabaptists' in the bishopric of Munster (West Germany) in 1534. Matthias (or Matthison) was a tailor of Haarlem, his convert Kniperdoling was a man of good birth and considerable eminence. They "committed all the enormous crimes and ridiculous follies which the most perverse and infernal imagination could suggest" — *Mosheim*.

P. 48, l. 35. **Leading strings**, strings with which children used to be guided and supported when learning to walk.

P. 51, l. 11. **Assertors** of the liberty of the church in France from Roman control.

P. 51, l. 12. **Jansenists**, a party in the French Church which traced its origin to Cornelius Jansen, Bishop of Ypres (d. 1638). In the bitter controversy with the Jesuits the chief champion of the Jansenists was Pascal.

P. 51, l. 13. **The philosophers**, Rousseau, Diderot, Voltaire, etc.

P. 52, l. 11. **The supremacy**. Henry wished to be acknowledged the head of the Church, but did not wish any of its doctrines changed.

P. 53, l. 3. **The mystical Babylon**. Violent Protestants took the Babylon described and denounced in the vision of John (Rev. xvii.) to mean the Church of Rome.

P. 53, l. 4. **Bishop Hooper** of Gloucester, burnt in 1555.

P. 53, l. 6. **Bishop Ridley** of London, burnt with Latimer in 1555.

P. 53, l. 8. **The Eucharist**, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper (Gk., *eucharistia*, thanksgiving). Hooper ordered it to be administered in the middle of churches at tables, so as to depart as far as possible from the Romish practice of administering it at the east end on an altar.

P. 53, l. 11. **Bishop Jewel** of Salisbury. The letter from which Macaulay quotes will be found in Burnet's *Reformation*, Part III, Book vi. (ed. Nares, ii., 434)

P. 53, l. 12. **A relique**. Macaulay imitates the Elizabethan spelling.

P. 53, l. 14. **Archbishop Grindal** of Canterbury, appointed Bishop of

London in 1558, Archbishop of York in 1570, and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1576; died 1583.

P. 53, l. 15. **Dislike . . . consecration.** Burnet quotes a letter in which Grindal says "he did not approve of the Queen's taking away the estates of the bishoprics . . . he had also a doubt concerning the popish vestments". Hooper obtained leave from the King and the Council to be consecrated "without superstition".

Macauley might have added that in 1560 Thomas Sampson, afterwards Dean of Christ Church, actually refused the bishopric of Norwich.

P. 53, l. 17. **Bishop Parkhurst**, of Norwich.

P. 53, l. 19. **Zurich.** Parkhurst, like many of the other Reformers who fled from England in the days of Mary, had found refuge in Switzerland. Zwingli was the leader of the Reformers at Zurich.

P. 53, l. 20. **Ponet**, Bishop successively of Rochester and Winchester.

P. 53, l. 33. **An union.** Macauley does not follow the custom of writing *a* before a word beginning with a *u* sound.

P. 54, l. 9. **Cranmer.** Macauley in his Essay on Hallam's *History* treats Cranmer with even greater severity. Hallam's own estimate, though not favourable, is more judicial than Macauley's. A juster and better-informed estimate will be found in Pollard's *Thomas Cranmer*.

P. 54, l. 25. **Lukewarm.** In provincial dialects *luke* is *lew*, evidently the A S *hlcow*, tepid. The evolution of *luke* is obscure. "Thou art *lew* and nether could nether hoot."—Wyclif's translation, Rev. iii. 16.

P. 54, l. 32. **Geneva**, whose church, under the influence of Calvin, departed most widely from the Church of Rome.

P. 54, l. 36. **Breviaries**, liturgies, literally, *abbreviations* of the prayers, etc., used in the service of the Church. The breviary most used in England before the Reformation was arranged by Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury, during the reign of William I. It is known as the "Sarum use".

P. 55, l. 2. **Arminian.** The Arminians were the followers of Arminius, Professor of Divinity at Leyden. They refused to accept the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute predestination. The teaching of the Church of England on predestination is contained in the Seventeenth Article.

P. 55, l. 5. **Baptismal regeneration**, literally, being born again through baptism. The Catholic and Protestant views of the effect of ' ' ' ' are different. When the Prayer-book was revised, after the ' ' ' ' of Charles II, the Puritans tried to remove whatever might imply acceptance of the Catholic view.

P. 55, l. 11. **On the Galilean mount.** See Matt. xxviii. 16-20.

P. 55, l. 12. **At Trent**, close to the Italian frontier in the Austrian Tyrol, where a council of the Church met in 1545. The most readable account is Froude's *Lectures on the Council of Trent*.

P. 55, l. 13. **Regarded prelacy as . . . unlawful.** John Udall undertakes to prove this by a series of propositions almost after the manner of Euclid, in his "Demonstration of the Truth of that Discipline which Christ hath prescribed in His Word for the Government

of His Church in all Times and Places until the End of the World," 1588.

P. 55, l. 21. **On one important occasion.** In 1543, when he and others drew up "A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man". In this and in "A declaration made of the functions and divine institution of bishops and priests," bishops and priests are spoken of as one and the same office.

P. 55, l. 37. **In a dead language, Latin.**

P. 56, l. 13. **Kneeling.** In the Exceptions against the Book of Common Prayer drawn up by the Presbyterians in 1661, when its revision was under consideration, they say, "we also desire that the kneeling at the sacrament . . . may be left free" [optional].

P. 56, l. 16. **A robe.** In the "first address and proposals of the ministers" they ask "may it please your Majesty . . . that the use of the surplice . . . may be abolished".

In 1566 certain Puritan clergy published "A Brief Discourse against the outward Apparel and ministering Garments of the Popish Church".

P. 57, l. 28. **Hildebrand, Pope Gregory VII.,** who magnified the authority of the papacy to the highest degree.

P. 57, l. 35. **The . . . power of the keys,** the authority claimed by the Pope of administering the discipline of the church and communicating or withholding its privileges. See Matt. xvi 19.

P. 59, l. 10, note **Strype.** The opinions which Macaulay has paraphrased will be found in Strype's "Ecclesiastical Memorials, relating chiefly to Religion and the Reformation of it and the Emergencies of the Church of England under King Henry VIII., King Edward VI., and Queen Mary I."

P. 59, l. 17. **Had forbidden.** "Let your women keep silence in the churches." (1 Cor. xiv. 34)

P. 59, l. 23. **The Anglican confession of faith** is contained in the Thirty-nine Articles drawn up in 1562.

P. 60, l. 6. **To commissioners.** By the Act of Supremacy, 1559, § 8.

P. 60, l. 9. **Power of nominating spiritual pastors.** When the Church was endowed by the munificence of kings and nobles her temporal possessions were regarded as benefices and the sovereign invested the ecclesiastic with his civil rights. In process of time this resulted in the nomination by the emperor without the intervention of the spiritual authorities to all the highest preferments in the Church. This grievance Hildebrand (Gregory VII.) determined to redress, but he aimed not merely at reforming the corrupt exercise of right but at the overthrow of the right itself. This gave rise to a contest which lasted for fifty-six years and occasioned sixty battles. It was settled by compromise in 1122. The great quarrel between Henry I. and Anselm was on the question of lay investiture and had nearly the same issue.

P. 60, l. 13. **In our time.** At the "Disruption" in 1843 when nearly five hundred ministers left the Established (Presbyterian) Church and formed the Free Church of Scotland.

P. 60, l. 19. **One of the articles of her faith,** the Twenty-first,

P. 60, l. 37. **From Calvinists and from Papists.** Macaulay does not mean that the Calvinists or Papists were disloyal, though during the reign of Elizabeth some Papists were

P. 61, l. 6. **In France . . . Third,** during the long Civil War, 1562-1589. The Massacre of Saint Bartholomew was one of the incidents in this war.

P. 61, l. 10. **On the north of the Trent,** in 1569, when the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland rose in rebellion.

P. 61, l. 21. **Serving two masters.** See Matt. vi. 24.

P. 61, l. 22. **The Lord . . . Baal.** See 1 Kings xviii. 21.

P. 62, l. 23. **The bearer of the keys.** See note to p. 57, l. 35.

P. 62, l. 24. **The Beast.** As the Protestants thought the Pope symbolised by the Babylon of Revelation (See note to p. 53, l. 3) they thought him symbolised under the Beast (Rev. xiii.).

P. 62, l. 25. **Antichrist, the Man of Sin.** The Antichrist is not mentioned by name in the Bible but several passages in Daniel, in John's Epistles, and in the Revelation, as well as the "Man of Sin" in 2 Thessalonians ii. 3 were said to refer to him, and violent Protestants saw in the Pope his representative. Cranmer in February, 1536, preached a sermon at St. Paul's Cross, to prove that the Pope was Antichrist.

P. 62, l. 28. **The Vatican,** the palace of the Pope.

P. 63, l. 13 **The Homilies,** sermons set forth by authority and appointed to be read in churches. The first book was issued in 1547 and the second in 1563. See Article Thirty-five of the Church of England.

P. 63, l. 24 **Synod.** There have been synods in the Catholic Church, but Macaulay uses the term for the governing bodies of certain Protestant Churches.

P. 64, l. 8 **Divided against herself.** See note to p. 61, l. 6.

P. 64, l. 14 **Mightiest prince of the age,** Philip II. of Spain.

P. 64, l. 26. **Dark plots,** the Ridolfi Plot, 1572; the Throckmorton Plot, 1583, and the Babington Conspiracy, 1585.

P. 64, l. 35. **The Puritans . . . prayed.** John Udall, who was condemned to death for being a Puritan, writes. "I will be tried to be so far the Q[ueen's] friend as that I wishe so wel vnto her as vnto mine owne soule".—*Diutrefhes* (Arber's "An English Scholar's Library"), 21.

John Penry, the Welsh martyr, writes. "Let our God remember Queen Elizabeth herein and wipe not out hir kindnes shewed toward Thy people; shew mercy vnto hir in that daie, good Lord, and forget hir not in this life also".—Quoted by Arber, *Martin Marprelate*, 57.

P. 65, l. 3 **One of the most stubborn,** John Stubbs

P. 65, l. 5 **An offence,** writing "The Discovery of the Gaping Gulf whereinto England is likely to be swallowed by another French Marriage if the Lord forbid not the Banns".

P. 65, l. 11, note **Neal,** Daniel Neal (1678-1743), who wrote. "The History of the Puritans or Protestant Nonconformists from the Reformation to the Death of Elizabeth".

P 65, l 17. **The United Provinces.** The Rebellion of the Netherlands against Spain began in 1576, and the struggle went on till the Peace of Antwerp in 1609.

P. 65, l. 18 **Henry IV.**, who had been a Protestant, secured the throne of France in 1579

P 65, l. 19. **The death of Philip II.** of Spain in 1598.

P. 66, l. 30. **Redressed the grievance.** A full report of the Queen's message to the Commons and of the debate preceding it is included in Prothero, *Statutes*, 111 *et seq.*

P. 67, l. 31. **A few weeks.** Lord Mountjoy defeated O'Neil, Earl of Tyrone, and his Spanish allies on 24th December, 1601. Tyrone agreed to submit on 22nd December, 1602, and was actually received by Mountjoy in Dublin on 30th March, 1603, six days after the death of Queen Elizabeth.

P. 67, l. 35. **When**, 7th June, 1603, the day on which James I. received O'Neil, Earl of Tyrone, and O'Donnell (afterwards) Earl of Tyrconnel.

P. 67, l. 37. **At Whitehall**, should be at Hampton Court

P. 68, l. 1. **Ran**, were obeyed, had force.

P. 69, l. 5. **Wrote Latin verse.** Macaulay is thinking of George Buchanan, tutor of James I

P. 69, l. 6 **Vida.** Marco Giralomo Vida (*d.* 1566), favoured by Leo X. and Clement VII., wrote Latin verse marked by much grace of style.

P. 69, l 7. **Made discoveries in science.** Macaulay is thinking of John Napier of Merchiston (1550-1617), the inventor of logarithms and of the present method of decimal fractions.

P. 69, l 12. **Eye of Spenser.** Spenser says the poems "savoured of sweetest wit and good invention but skilled not of the goodly ornaments of Poetrye yet they were sprinkled with some pretty flowers of their owne naturall devise which gave good grace and comeliness unto them".

P. 70, l. 4. **Could pass no law.** By Poyning's Act, which was passed in 1494 and repealed in 1782.

P. 70, l. 17. **Their idolatrous sovereign**, Queen Mary

P. 71, l. 16 **Milesian.** Milesians is another name for the Scots, the last of the pre-historic settlers in Ireland.

P. 72, l. 36. **Maurice of Nassau** (1567-1625), Prince of Orange, leader of the revolted Netherlands in the war against the Spaniards.

P. 72, l. 37. **Gustavus Adolphus**, Gustavus II, King of Sweden (1594-1632), the most brilliant general in the Thirty Years' War. After taking many towns and repeatedly defeating the Imperial generals he was slain at the Battle of Lutzen. See Gardiner, *The Thirty Years' War* (Epochs of Modern History)

P. 73, l. 2. **Tilly and Spinola**, generals opposed to Gustavus Adolphus in the Thirty Years' War.—*Ibid.*

P. 73, l 11 **Began his administration.** James put an end to the war with Spain at once, but no actual treaty was signed till 1604.

P. 73, l. 18. **His favourite**, the Duke of Buckingham

P. 73, l. 20. **His family.** James's daughter Elizabeth was married to Frederick, the Elector Palatine, who had been driven out of an acquired dominion (Bohemia) in 1620 and out of his inherited dominion in 1622.

P. 73, l. 35. **Filmer.** Sir Robert Filmer (*d.* 1653) formed the theories of the divine right of kings into a system in his *Patnarcha*, published posthumously in 1680.

P. 74, l. 5. **Anterior to the . . . Mosaic dispensation.** Filmer traces it back to Adam

P. 74, l. 29. **We read,** in 1 Sam. viii.

P. 75, l. 18. **The Homily on Wilful Rebellion** was added to the second book of *Homilies* after the rebellion of the northern Earls in 1569. It consists of six discourses, and contains such doctrines as "that kings and princes, as well the evil as the good, do reign by God's ordinance, and that subjects are bounden to obey them".

P. 75, l. 33. **The highest authority,** Parliament. In 1536, after Henry VIII. had married Jane Seymour, he got an Act of Succession passed settling the crown on the new queen's children, and declaring both Mary and Elizabeth illegitimate.

P. 75, l. 37. **Obtained,** in 1544. Henry made a will leaving the crown, on failure of his own descendants, to the descendants of his younger sister Mary, Duchess of Suffolk, excluding those of his elder sister, Margaret, who was married to James IV. of Scotland.

P. 76, l. 4. **Assumed a similar power** when he left the crown by will to Lady Jane Grey, the grand-daughter of Mary, Duchess of Suffolk

P. 76, l. 9. **To pass a law,** the Treason Act of 1571 (13 Eliz. c. 1.).

P. 76, l. 17. **The testament of Henry VIII.** See note to p. 75, l. 37.

P. 76, l. 34. **Kingcraft.** "Nor must I forget to let you know how perfect the king was in the art of dissimulation, or, to give it his own phrase, kingcraft." Weldon, *Court of James I.*, 102.

P. 77, l. 1. **Augustus and Napoleon,** who exercised imperial power under republican forms.

P. 77, l. 10. **Deity might lawfully do.** In a speech to his Parliament James said, "Kings are justly called gods. . . . To dispute what God may do is blasphemy . . . so it is sedition in subjects to dispute what a king may do in the plenitude of his power." Aikin, *James I.*, 350.

P. 78, l. 7. **Hammond.** Henry Hammond (1605-1660), chaplain to Charles I. His theological writings are still in some repute, and his *Prayers* by Bishop Fell, is a fine piece of work. It is rather difficult to see why Macaulay associates him with Laud

P. 78, l. 24. **Confessors,** strictly those who avow their religion in the face of danger, and adhere to it under persecution and torture, but do not suffer martyrdom.

P. 79, l. 1. **We have already seen.** See p. 55

P. 79, l. 3. **Cooper.** Thomas Cooper (*d.* 1594), Bishop of Winchester.

P. 79, l. 8, note. **His Answer,** "An Admonition to the People o

England wherein are answered not only the slanderous Vntruethes reprochfully vttered by Martin the Libeller but also many other Crimes by some of his Broode objected generally against all Bishops and the chiefe of the Cleargie purposely to deface and discredite the present State of the Church," 1589. (Reprinted by Arber in "An English Scholar's Library".)

Martin Marprelate was the name assumed by the writers of pamphlets published in 1589-90 attacking the temporal power of the bishops. There is some dispute as to who the writers were, but it is generally admitted that Udall and Penry, already mentioned, were among them. See Arber, *Martin Marprelate*.

P. 80, l. 5. **A Scotch minister**, John Morrison.

P. 80, l. 12, note. **Canon 55 of 1603**. "Before all sermons, lectures, and homilies, the preachers and ministers shall move the people to join with them in prayer in this form . . . 'Ye shall pray for Christ's holy Catholic Church, that is for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland . . .'"

P. 80, l. 14. **Œcumenical councils**, councils representing the universal Church

P. 80, l. 15. **Dort**. The Synod of Dort (1618-19) was convened to compose the troubles caused by the Arminian controversy (See note p. 55, l. 2).

P. 80, l. 16. **An English Bishop**, Carleton, Bishop of Llandaff.

P. 81, l. 11. **Apostolical orders**. It is held that there were in the Primitive Church bishops, priests, and deacons, that the Apostles ordained their successors, and that the apostolical succession has continued unbroken to the present day

P. 81, l. 28. **Days and places**, saints' days and holy places.

P. 82, l. 3. **Celibacy**, the celibacy of the "secular" clergy and of monks, friars, and nuns.

P. 82, l. 4. **Prophetically condemned**. See 1 Tim. iv. 1-3.

P. 82, l. 18. **A minister of the established religion**, Nicholas Ferrar, (1592-1637), who, after some years devoted to public business, retired to Little Gidding in 1625, where (after being ordained deacon) he established what would now be called an Anglican community composed of his mother, with the families of his brother and sister

P. 82, l. 33 **Towards the close of Elizabeth's reign**, in 1595.

P. 83, l. 3 **The Lambeth Articles**, so called because they were drawn up in the Archbishop of Canterbury's palace at Lambeth. Digested under nine heads they asserted nine distinctive Calvinistic doctrines. They were not accepted by the Church and gave offence to the queen

P. 83, l. 7. **One clergyman**. "One Mr. [William] Barret, Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, in his sermon *ad clerum* declared himself against Calvin's doctrines about predestination and falling from grace, reflecting with some sharpness on that great divine, and advising his hearers not to read him. For this he was summoned before the vice-chancellor and heads of colleges and obliged to retract in Saint Mary's Church."—*Neal*.

P. 83, l. 14 **The great French reformer, Calvin.**

P. 83, l. 19. **Pronounced.** "A founder it [the "Lord's discipline"] had, whom, for mine own part, I think incomparably the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy. . . . Though thousands were debtors to him as teaching [divine] knowledge . . . yet he to none but only to God."—Preface to the *Ecclesiastical Policy*, chap. ii., § 1 (ed. 1888, i., 127).

P. 83, l. 28. **Grotius . . . Barneveldt.** After the assassination of William the Silent, Maurice of Nassau and Jan van Olden Barneveldt were the leaders (one as soldier and the other as statesman) of the revolt of the United Provinces. When Spain had acknowledged the independence of the Netherlands religious disputes grew more bitter. Maurice, having his mind poisoned by false insinuations against his old associate, took the opposite (the Calvinist) side. Barneveldt was tried by a special tribunal composed largely of his enemies, and condemned to die. The ablest of his supporters, Huig van Groot (Grotius) was, as unjustly, condemned to perpetual imprisonment. The English ambassador, Sir Dudley Carleton, encouraged the Calvinists.

P. 84, l. 8. **A divine of that age,** George Morley (1597-1684). Clarendon, who is the authority for the story, does not give the date of the conversation but it apparently occurred while Morley was chaplain to the Earl of Carnarvon. He was afterwards made Bishop of Winchester.

P. 85, l. 20. **The prophet, Samuel.** See 1 Sam. xv. 33.

P. 85, l. 20. **The rebel general.** Jehu.

P. 85, l. 21. **A queen, Jezebel.** The statement that Jehu gave the blood of Jezebel to the dogs is ambiguous if not erroneous. See 2 Kings ix. 34.

P. 85, l. 22. **The matron, Deborah.** See Judges v. 21.

P. 85, l. 29. **The synagogue was in its worst state** when the Pharisees were in the ascendant.

P. 85, l. 33. **Their washed hands.** See Mark vii. 1-7.

P. 85, l. 34. **Phylacteries.** See Matt. xxiii. 5.

P. 85, l. 35. **Sabbathbreaker.** See Luke xii. 10-17.

P. 85, l. 35. **Winebibber.** See Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 34.

P. 86, l. 1. **Lovelocks.** Two long locks hanging down in front. They were denounced by Greene, Prynne, Hall, Phineas Fletcher, etc.

P. 86, l. 1. **Starch.** Philip Stubbs calls it "the devil's liquor".

P. 86, l. 2. **Virginals,** a stringed instrument played by means of a key-board like a modern piano. It was often spoken of as a pair of virginals (*cf.* a pair of stairs) or simply virginals.

P. 87, l. 10. **A war, the war with Spain, 1624.**

P. 89, l. 18. **Billeted.** When soldiers are billeted on a person he has to maintain them, presumably for payment. In the days of Charles I. the maintenance was more certain than the payment. See Gardiner, *History of England, 1603-1642*, vi., 219.

P. 89, l. 19. **Martial law.** *Ibid.*, vi., 156.

P. 89, l. 31. **The Petition of Right.** See Gardiner, *Constitutional Documents*, 1.

P. 90, l. 6. **Ancient form of words**, which is still used in signifying the royal assent to Acts of Parliament, *Le roi le veut*.

P. 90, l. 33. **Only once.** Should be *twice*. The third Parliament of Henry VIII. was dissolved on 22nd December, 1515, and the fourth met on 15th April, 1523; the fourth was dissolved on 13th August 1523, and the fifth met on 3rd November, 1530.

P. 91, l. 33. **Richelieu.** Armand Jean Duplessis, Cardinal, Duc de Richelieu (1585-1642) "built up the power of the French crown. . . . Throughout life he moved onwards to his goal with the strongest tenacity of purpose, unmoved either by fear or pity. He destroyed the local liberties of France, and crushed every element of constitutional government, and his policy overwhelmed the citizens with taxation and made waste places of some of her fairest provinces and most thriving towns."

P. 92, l. 5, note. **The correspondence of Wentworth**, edited by William Knowler was published in 1739. The selection by Hallam to which Macaulay refers will be found in the *Constitutional History*, ii., 69-74.

P. 92, l. 22, note. **Wentworth's own words.** The letter will be found in the *Correspondence*, i., 344.

P. 94, l. 18. **Act of prerogative**, not of Charles I. but of Henry VIII. who established the Council of the North after the suppression of the Pilgrimage of Grace. The powers of the Council had, however, gradually grown, till there was hardly any room for the execution of the ordinary law.

P. 94, l. 24 **By Clarendon.** Macaulay is summarising not quoting.

P. 95, l. 3. **The Lord Keeper** of the great seal. The officer who now has charge of it is the Lord Chancellor.

P. 95, l. 21. **By the admission of the Royalists**, e.g., Clarendon, who, after describing various means tried for raising a revenue says, "and lastly, for a spring and magazine that should have no bottom, and for an everlasting supply of all occasions a writ was framed, etc."

P. 96, l. 1. **The smallest possible**, seven to five.

P. 96, l. 4. **Wentworth . . . observed**, in the paper of 31st March, 1637, from which Macaulay has already quoted. "It is plain that the opinion delivered by the judges declaring the lawfulness of the assignment for the shipping is the greatest service that profession hath done the crown in my time . . . This, methinks, convinces a power for the sovereign to raise payments for land forces."

P. 97, l. 33 **Lords of Articles.** When the Scotch Estates assembled they decided on the general tenour of the measures desirable. Certain persons were then chosen from each Estate to be a committee on the "Articles". They prepared and matured each measure and submitted their proceedings to the Estates. Courtiers desirous of influencing the proceedings accomplished their purpose by corrupting the constitution of the "Lords of the Articles".

P. 98, l. 1. **Their first James** was murdered on 20th February, 1436.

Macaulay is not strictly correct in saying that the king was butchered in his bedchamber.

P. 98, l. 3. **James II.** was killed in 1460, the last eight years of his reign having been spent in a struggle with the Douglasses.

P. 98, l. 4. **James III.** fled from the battle of Sauchie Burn (between Bannockburn and Stirling) in 1488. Injured by a fall from his horse, he was carried into a cottage. The cottager rushed out shouting for "a priest to shrive the king". A man passing said that he was a priest, but when admitted to the bedside he stabbed the wounded man again and again.

P. 98, l. 5. **James V.** placed at the head of his army a worthless favourite whom his nobles refused to obey at Solway Moss in 1542. The army was therefore defeated, and the king died a few days after.

P. 98, l. 7. **Her son, James I. of England.**

P. 99, l. 1. **Several changes, e.g.,** Laud's control of the Scotch bishops and the promulgation in 1636 of the Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical.

P. 99, l. 15. **The first performance,** at St. Giles's Church, Edinburgh, on 23rd July 1637, when (the probably mythical) Jenny Geddes flung a stool at the head of the officiating divine.

P. 99, l. 23. **Antiphonies, anthems.**

P. 99, l. 29, note. **Wentworth.** For a summary of the letter and some extracts see Gardiner, *History of England*, viii, 35.

P. 100, l. 9. **By the most distinguished Royalists, e.g.,** Clarendon, who mentions the incident "only that the temper and sobriety of that House may be taken notice of, and their dissolution, which shortly after fell out, the more lamented".

P. 100, l. 26. **Members of the House of Commons,** Sir John Hotham and Henry Bellasis.

P. 100, l. 35. **Recently,** in 1628.

P. 100, l. 37. **May 1640.** On a glover named John Archer, whose crime was beating a drum before a mob that marched to Lambeth Palace intending to frighten (and perhaps harm) Laud.

P. 102, l. 23. **Men who . . . liberty.** Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, who for writing against the bishops were sentenced by the Star Chamber on 14th June, 1637, to lose their ears, to pay £5,000 each, and to be imprisoned for life. See Gardiner, *History of England*, viii., 288.

P. 102, l. 30. **On the day.** The royal assent was given to the two Bills on 10th May, 1641.

P. 103, l. 8. **The two great parties.** See p. 105.

P. 104, l. 21. **The Triennial Act,** an Act passed in February, 1641, directing that Parliament should meet every three years even if the king did not summon it.

P. 104, l. 28. **Colepepper.** John Colepepper made a great speech against monopolies, impeached Judge Berkeley on behalf of the Commons, and took part in the proceedings against Strafford, but in 1642 he was taken into court favour and made Chancellor of the Exchequer; in 1644 he was created Lord Colepepper. He died in 1660.

P. 104, l. 30. **Digby**, George Digby, afterwards Earl of Bristol.

P. 104, l. 30. **The impeachment of the Lord Keeper**, Finch. Falkland attacked Finch in the House of Commons on 7th December, 1640, and was supported by Hyde.

Falkland died fighting for the king at Newbury in 1643, and Hyde, afterwards Earl of Clarendon, was from 1642 a constant adviser of Charles I., and for the first seven years after the Restoration the chief minister of Charles II.

P. 104, l. 31. **The Lord Lieutenant**, Strafford. The Commons had reason to suspect that the king was arranging for his escape, and on 28th April, 1641, Hyde took a message from the Lords asking that special precautions might be taken to prevent it.

P. 105, l. 18. **Obsolete**. They have, however, become almost obsolete, and are now used as terms of mild reproach for the most reactionary of Conservatives and the most unprogressive of Liberals.

The earliest use of the term *Conservative* for *Tory* is believed to be in an article by Wilson Croker, published in *The Quarterly Review* for January, 1830. *Liberal*, which was already employed in French and Spanish politics, began to be used in England about the same time. Macaulay in 1832 speaks of the "new cant word *Conservative*" (*Writings and Speeches*, ed. 1860, ii., 79).

P. 106, l. 12. **Twice**. In 1660 and 1688.

P. 107, l. 14. **Merry Andrew**, a jester, buffoon, clown. The name *Andrew*, is said to have been given to jesters in memory of Andrew Boorde, a doctor of physic in the reign of Henry VIII, to whom several jest books are ascribed.

P. 107, l. 18. **The Queen**, Henrietta Maria, youngest daughter of Henry IV. of France.

P. 109, l. 2. **In a foreign land**. When Lord Finch was impeached he fled to Holland.

P. 109, l. 37. **Valuable consideration** is a legal term. A consideration is the reason which moves a contracting party to enter into an agreement, the material cause of a contract. Considerations are of various kinds; a valuable consideration is such as money. The valuable consideration for the Petition of Right was the subsidy granted by the Commons when Charles I. assented to the Petition.

P. 110, l. 29. **On a sudden**, in 1641.

P. 112, l. 6. **By only eleven votes**, by 159 to 148.

P. 113, l. 1. **Emigrating to America**. The story that Cromwell and Hampden were stopped by order of the king when about to sail for New England is without foundation.

P. 113, l. 30. **The Attorney-General**, Sir Edward Herbert.

P. 114, l. 19. **His Great Council**, the Parliament.

P. 114, l. 37. **The trainbands**, the militia.

P. 116, l. 26. **In 1399 and in 1689**, after the fall of Richard II. and of James II.

P. 119, l. 27. **Described by Cromwell**, in a speech to the Committee of Ninety-nine, 13th April, 1657. Cromwell described the troops of

Hampden as "old decayed serving men and tapsters and such kind of fellows".

P. 120, l. 13. **He had borne arms on the Continent**, in 1620, when he commanded a company in the regiment of English volunteers which set forth to the Palatinate, though he scarcely saw any service.

P. 120, l. 21. **Rupert**, the son of Frederick, Elector Palatine, and Elizabeth, daughter of James I.; hence the nephew of Charles I. On the breaking out of the Civil War he was made General of the Horse.

P. 120, l. 36. **The Earl of Stamford** was defeated at Stratton, in the north of Cornwall, on 16th May, 1643. Clarendon says that Stamford, "as soon as he saw the day lost, and some say sooner, made all imaginable haste to Exeter".

P. 121, l. 3 **Pusillanimous**. On 26th July, 1643, when Prince Rupert's attack on Bristol had partly succeeded, Fiennes offered to surrender. Whether he could have longer resisted is a disputed question. The court-martial found him guilty only of improper surrender, thus tacitly exempting him from the charges of cowardice and treason which had been made against him by Prynne.

P. 121, l. 18 **Plots**, *e.g.*, Ogle's and Reade and Brooke's.

P. 121, l. 18. **Riots**, *e.g.*, that in the City on 12th December, 1642.

P. 121, l. 30. **Sate down before**, began the siege, *cf.* Fr., *siège*. "Nor would the enemy have sate down before it till they had done their business in all other places."—*Clarendon*.

P. 122, l. 13. **Independents**. Macaulay gives the reason for the name. Robert Brown, a clergyman of the days of Elizabeth, maintained the independence of every congregation, and his followers, down to the Civil War, were called Brownists. Their modern representatives are called Congregationalists.

P. 122, l. 17 **The Court of Arches**, the highest ecclesiastical court for the province of Canterbury. It received its name because its meetings were anciently held in the Church of Saint Mary-le-Bow (*S. Maria de Arcubus*, Saint Mary of the Arches). Macaulay names it and the Vatican because they were the courts of appeal for Anglicans and for Roman Catholics respectively.

P. 122, l. 21 **Root and branch men**. In December, 1640, a petition, signed by 15,000 Londoners, for the reform of the Church and the abolition of Episcopacy, "with all its dependencies, roots, and branches," was presented to the House of Commons.

"Nathaniel Fiennes, and young Sir Harry Vane, and, shortly afterwards, Mr Hampden . . . were believed to be for root and branch, which grew shortly after a common expression."—*Clarendon*.

P. 122, l. 21. **Kindred phrase**, kindred because the Radicals wanted reform from the roots. In Macaulay's day the term had hardly ceased to convey something of reproach.

P. 122, l. 32 **Among the Plantagenets**, in Westminster Abbey, whence his body was flung out at the Restoration.

P. 122, l. 33. **Had fallen.** He was wounded in a skirmish at Chalgrove Field near Oxford on 18th June, 1643, and died at Thame six days later.

P. 122, l. 35. **Bedford . . . Northumberland.** The Earls of Bedford and Northumberland abandoned the cause of the Parliament in August, 1643. Bedford made straight for Oxford where the king then was; Northumberland, with his usual caution, went to one of his country houses till he saw how Bedford was received.

P. 124, l. 3. **The Selfdenying Ordinance** (1645), in its original form, was intended to exclude all members of Parliament from commands in the army.

P. 124, l. 32. **The Primate,** Laud, beheaded on 10th January, 1645.

P. 124, l. 36 **The Solemn League and Covenant** (not to be confounded with the National Covenant signed by the Scots in 1638) was taken by the House of Commons on 25th September, 1643.

P. 125, l. 17. **Chapters.** A chapter is the governing body of a Cathedral or Collegiate Church presided over by the Dean.

P. 125, l. 30. **In the summer of 1647.** In July the Presbyterian leaders were expelled from the House of Commons. Pride's Purge did not take place till December, 1648.

P. 126, l. 10. **By purchase.** The purchase of commissions was abolished by royal warrant in 1871.

P. 126, l. 31. **Janissaries,** a term loosely used for any Turkish soldiers.

P. 128, l. 4. **Turenne,** one of the greatest French generals. In 1657 Cromwell sent 6,000 men to co-operate with the French army against the Spaniards. On 4th June, 1658, they defeated the Spaniards in the Battle of the Dunes and on the 14th Dunkirk surrendered. The incidents to which Macaulay alludes are described at length in "A True and Just Relation of Major-General Sir Thomas Morgan's Progress in France and Flanders with the 6,000 English in the Years 1657 to 1658 at the Taking of Dunkirk and Other Important Places".

P. 128, l. 30. **Pelagian.** *Pelagius* is the Latinised form of the Greek equivalent of the Welsh *Morgan*. Morgan is said to have been a monk of Bangor and to have flourished about 400. His particular heresy was a denial of the doctrine of original sin.

P. 129, l. 33. **Utterly destroyed,** at Preston on 17th August, 1648.

P. 130, l. 3. **Inconsistent with the Solemn League and Covenant.** The Third Article obliged the subscribers "to preserve and defend the King's Majesty's person and authority".

P. 130, l. 17. **A few years later.** In 1657 when he was asked to take the title of king.

P. 130, l. 30 **Hypocrisy.** Thanks to Carlyle no one now thinks Cromwell a hypocrite. It is interesting to note that when at the age of eight Macaulay wrote a "Universal History" he held the traditional opinion and described Cromwell as "an unjust and wicked man".

P. 131, l. 12. **Millennial reign of the Saints,** the period which they

considered predicted in the vision which John saw (Rev. xx.) of Satan being bound for a thousand years.

P. 181, l. 27. **At one time.** In 1647 when the army drew up a scheme called the Heads of the Proposals.

P. 181, l. 37. **A mutiny** broke out in the regiments of Harrison and Lilburne in November, 1647.

P. 182, l. 31. **Lord Glamorgan.** Edward Somerset, sixth Earl and second Marquis of Worcester, and titular Earl of Glamorgan, was selected by Charles I. in 1644 to raise troops in Ireland. Charles disallowed his commission in 1646.

P. 183, l. 2. **His most devoted friends**, *eg.*, Clarendon, who, on 12th February, 1647, wrote to Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State to Charles: "Those stratagems have given me more sad hours than all the misfortunes in war which have betfallen the King".

P. 186, l. 21. **Great cities**, Drogheda and Wexford.

P. 187, l. 10. **Two great battles**, Dunbar and Worcester.

P. 187, l. 35. **Filled the House**, on 19th April, 1653.

P. 188, l. 24. **The fleshpots.** See Exod. xvi. 8.

P. 140, l. 8. **Northumberland and Bedford, Manchester and Pembroke**, peers who have been on the parliamentary side

P. 141, l. 31. **A hundred and thirty years later.** In 1782 Pitt, before he became Prime Minister, had demanded an inquiry into the system of parliamentary representation.

P. 141, l. 34. **In 1832**, when the Reform Bill was passed.

P. 142, l. 31. **The Levellers**, an ultra-republican party which appeared in the army in 1647.

P. 144, l. 8. **Assassination.** The most eager plotter for the assassination of Cromwell was Edward Sexby, who (under the name of William Allan) wrote the pamphlet "Killing no Murder".

P. 145, l. 5. **A synagogue**, the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue at St. Mary Axe

P. 145, l. 23. **One of the finest West Indian Islands**, Jamaica.

P. 145, l. 24. **A fortress**, Dunkirk.

P. 145, l. 29. **Huguenots of Languedoc.** These, having attacked some Catholics at Nismes, were about to be punished. They sent a messenger to Cromwell, whose message to the French king saved them.

P. 145, l. 31. **Augsburg**, where the German Protestants drew up their Confession of Faith in 1580.

P. 145, l. 37. **Castle of Saint Angelo.** "When those of the Valley of Lucerne had unwarily risen in arms against the Duke of Savoy, which gave occasion to the Pope and the neighbour princes of Italy to call and solicit for their extirpation, and their prince positively resolved upon it, Cromwell sent his agent to the Duke of Savoy, a prince with whom he had no correspondence or commerce, and so engaged the cardinal, and even terrified the Pope himself, without so much as doing any grace to the English Catholics (nothing being more usual than his saying 'that his ships in the Mediterranean should visit

Civita Vecchia, and that the sound of his cannon should be heard in Rome') that the Duke of Savoy thought it necessary to restore all that he had taken from them, and did renew all those privileges they had formerly enjoyed and newly forfeited"—*Clarendon*.

P. 147, l. 32. **Excited almost to madness**, in the great struggle which resulted in the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832.